94

(1)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

071516 JUN 2 - 2008

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 07-

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

MARY J. BLIGE, BRUCE MILLER, RONALD LAWRENCE, DANA STINSON, AUSAR MUSIC, MARY J. BLIGE PUBLISHING, BRUCE MILLER PUBLISHING, MARY J. BLIGE MUSIC, DAYNA S. DAY PUBLISHING, WARNER-TAMERLANE PUBLISHING CORP., UMG RECORDINGS, INC., UNIVERSAL STUDIOS, INC., UNIVERSAL MUSIC PUBLISHING, INC., and UNIVERSAL MUSIC & VIDEO DISTRIBUTION CORP.,

Petitioners,

v.

SHARICE DAVIS,

Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JONATHAN D. DAVIS
Counsel of Record
JONATHAN D. DAVIS, P.C.
ROBERT P. MULVEY, OF COUNSEL
99 Park Avenue, Suite 1600
New York, New York 10016
(212) 687-5464
Attorneys for Petitioners
Mary J. Blige and
Mary J. Blige Music

(Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Pages)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

(1) Whether, absent an act of Congress, the statutory right of a copyright owner to freely alienate a copyright may be curtailed by prohibiting assignments or licenses that impact a co-owner's accrued infringement claim.

(2) Whether the statutory right of a copyright owner to memorialize a prior oral transfer of copyright can be invalidated by a co-owner, who is not a party to the transfer.

STATEMENT PURSUANT TO RULE 29.6

Petitioner Mary J. Blige Music has no parent corporations, and no publicly-held entity owns ten percent or more of its stock.

Petitioner UMG Recordings, Inc. (incorrectly sued herein as Universal Music Group, Inc. and MCA Records, Inc.), Universal Music Publishing, Inc. (incorrectly sued herein as Universal Music Publishing Group and Universal-MCA Music Publishing) and Universal Music & Video Distribution Corp. are direct subsidiaries of PolyGram Holding, Inc., which is a direct subsidiary of Universal Music Group, Inc., which is an indirect subsidiary of Vivendi Universal, S.A., a French publicly traded corporation.

Petitioner Universal Studios, Inc. is indirectly owned by NBC Universal, Inc., a non-public entity. NBC Universal, Inc. is indirectly owned by the General Electric Company and Vivendi Universal, S.A., both publicly traded entities.

Petitioner Warner Tamerlane Publishing Corp.'s (incorrectly sued herein as Warner-Tamerlane Music Publishing Corp.) ultimate parent corporation is Warner Music Group Corp., a publicly-held entity. No publicly-held entity owns ten percent or more of the stock in Warner Music Group Corp.

Petitioner Dayna's Day Publishing has no parent corporations, and no publicly-held entity owns ten percent or more of its stock.

Petitioner Ausar Music Publishing, Ltd. has no parent corporations, and no publicly-held entity owns ten percent or more of its stock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
STATEMENT PURSUANT TO RULE 29.6	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
TABLE OF APPENDICES	v
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES	vi
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	1
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION AND STATUTES	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
1. Summary of Relevant Facts	4
2. The District Court Opinion	6
3. The Court of Appeals Opinion	7

Contents

	Page
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	8
I. THE COURT SHOULD SAFEGUARD THE FREE AND UNFETTERED ALIENABILITY OF COPYRIGHT AS CREATED BY CONGRESS	8
II. THE COURT SHOULD SAFEGUARD THE RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF §204(a) OF THE ACT	15
CONCLUSION	18

TABLE OF APPENDICES

Page

Appendix A — Opinion Of The United States Court Of Appeals For The Second Circuit Decided October 5, 2007 ..... 1a

Appendix B — Memorandum, Opinion And Order Of The United States District Court For The Southern District Of New York Dated November 22, 2005 ..... 40a

Appendix C — Order Of The United States Court Of Appeals For The Second Circuit Denying Petition For Rehearing Filed March 4, 2008 ..... 58a

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases:

Aalmuhammed v. Lee,
202 F.3d 1227 (9th Cir. 2000) 10

ABKCO Music, Inc. v. Harrisongs Music, Ltd.,
722 F.2d 988 (2d Cir. 1983) 15

ABKCO Music, Inc. v. Harrisongs Music, Ltd.,
944 F.2d 971 (2d Cir. 1991) 11, 16

Billy-Bob Teeth, Inc. v. Novelty, Inc.,
329 F.3d 586 (7th Cir. 2003) 16

Bobbs-Merrill Co. v. Straus,
210 U.S. 339 (1908) 8, 13, 17

Cmty. For Creative Non-Violence v. Reid,
490 U.S. 730 (1989) 17

Eden Toys, Inc.
v. Florelee Undergarment Co., Inc.,
697 F.2d 27 (2d Cir. 1982) 16

Eldred v. Ashcroft,
537 U.S. 186 (2003) 8, 17

Ethicon v. United States Surgical Corp.,
135 F.3d 1456 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*,
525 U.S. 923 (1998) 13

Cited Authorities

Page

Imperial Residential Design, Inc. v. Palms Development Group, Inc., 70 F.3d 96 (11th Cir. 1995) 16

Magnuson v. Video Yesteryear, 85 F.3d 1424 (9th Cir. 1996) 16

New York Times Co., Inc. v. Tasini, 533 U.S. 483 (2001) 14

Prather v. Neva Paperbacks, Inc., 410 F.2d 698 (5th Cir. 1969) 12, 16

Silvers v. Sony Pictures Entertainment, 402 F.3d 881 (9th Cir. 2005) 11

Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc., 464 U.S. 417 (1984) 13

Stewart v. Abend, 495 U.S. 207 (1990) 8, 17

Thomson v. Larson, 147 F.3d 195 (2d Cir. 1998) 10, 13

Univ. of Colo. Found., Inc. v. American Cyanamid Co., 196 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 13

Cited Authorities

Page

Viacom Int'l Inc. v. Tandem Prod., Inc.,
526 F.2d 593 (2d Cir. 1975) 12-13

Wheaton v. Peters,
33 U.S. (8 Pet.) 591 (1834) 8, 17

White-Music Pub. Co. v. Apollo Co.,
209 U.S. 1 (1908) 12

United States Constitution:

Art. I, §8, cl. 8 ..... 1, 15

Statutes:

17 U.S.C. §101 9

17 U.S.C. §106 11

17 U.S.C. §106(A)(e) 9

17 U.S.C. §201(a) 2, 9

17 U.S.C. §201(c) 14

17 U.S.C. §201(d)(1) 2, 9, 10

17 U.S.C. §203(a)(5) 9

17 U.S.C. §204(a) ..... *passim*

17 U.S.C. §304(c) 9

Cited Authorities

Page

17 U.S.C. §501(b) 11, 13

35 U.S.C. §262 13

Other Authorities:

H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476 (1976) 9, 10, 12

S. Report No. 94-473 (1975) 10, 12

8 Donald S. Chisum,
Chisum on Patents §21.03[3][d] 13

1 Melvin B. Nimmer & David Nimmer,
Nimmer on Copyright (2005) §6.11 ..... 10, 12

Petitioners respectfully jointly petition for a writ of *certiorari* to review the order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which was entered on October 5, 2007.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals is reported at 505 F.3d 90 (2d Cir. 2007) (App. A). The opinion of the United States District Court for the Southern District is reported at 419 F. Supp.2d 493 (S.D.N.Y. 2005) (App. B).

JURISDICTION

The order of the Court of Appeals was entered on October 5, 2007. Petitioners timely filed a petition for rehearing and suggestion for rehearing *en banc* with the Court of Appeals. The petition was denied on March 4, 2008 (App. C). This Court has jurisdiction to review the judgment of the Court of Appeals by writ of *certiorari* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION AND STATUTES

Article I, §8, cl. 8 of the United States Constitution provides that Congress is empowered:

> To promote the progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.

Section 201(a) of the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. §201(a), provides, in pertinent part:

> The authors of a joint work are coowners of copyright in the work.

Section 201(d)(1) of the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. §201(d)(1), provides:

> The ownership of a copyright may be transferred in whole or in part by any means of conveyance or by operation of law, and may be bequeathed by will or pass as personal property by the applicable laws of intestate succession.

Section 204(a) of the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. §204(a), provides:

> A transfer of copyright ownership, other than by operation of law, is not valid unless an instrument of conveyance, or a note or memorandum of the transfer, is in writing and signed by the owner of the rights conveyed or such owner's duly authorized agent.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Court of Appeals reversed summary judgment, entered by the District Court, dismissing an action brought by Sharice Davis, which alleged that two musical compositions, "LOVE" and "Keep It Moving" (the "Album Compositions"), recorded by renowned artist Mary J. Blige, A.4,[1] and contained on the *No More Drama* album (the "Blige Album"), infringed Davis' purported copyrights in two musical compositions in which she claimed original authorship (the "Disputed Compositions"). The named petitioning authors of the allegedly infringing compositions are Blige, Bruce Miller (Blige's half brother), Ronald Lawrence (identified as a co-writer of "LOVE" only), and Dana Stinson (identified as a co-writer of "Keep It Moving" only). Kwame Holland is also a co-writer of both infringing compositions, but is a non-appearing named party to this proceeding.

The Court of Appeals broadly ruled that assignments or licenses of copyrights can only operate prospectively if they impact the accrued infringement claims of co-owners (whether known or unknown). The opinion is manifestly inconsistent with the free and unfettered alienability of copyright interests provided by the Copyright Act of 1976 ("Act") and its legislative history. It materially distorts the legislative scheme created by Congress by changing the nature of the relationship between co-owners, diminishes the value of copyright ownership, introduces great uncertainty in the marketplace for copyrighted material of every kind, and undermines a copyright owner's ability to settle infringement claims.

---

1. References to the Appendix to this petition are referred to herein as "A.__."

The Court of Appeals' opinion also curtails the statutory right of copyright owners to memorialize prior oral transfers, subordinating this well-recognized right to the veto power of a co-owner, who possesses an accrued infringement claim.

Such radical judicial reconfigurations of the rights of copyright owners to transfer their rights contravene legislative intent and should be undertaken, if at all, by Congress.

1. Summary of Relevant Facts

This case arises from the 2001 commercial release of the Blige Album on which Blige was the solo artist. Davis alleges in her complaint that the song "LOVE" is virtually identical to her composition "L.O.V.E.," and that the song "Keep It Moving" is strikingly similar to her composition, "Don't Trade in My Love."

Davis registered the Disputed Compositions with the Copyright Office only after the commercial release of the Blige Album. In those registrations, Davis identified non-party Bruce Chambliss as her co-author, a fact that she did not disclose in her complaint. Chambliss is Miller's natural father and Blige's stepfather.

Chambliss testified that he wrote the Disputed Compositions by himself. He further testified that before the release of the allegedly infringing works he orally assigned all of the musical works he created to his son, including the Disputed Compositions. A.47. Chambliss testified that it was his intention that his son be free to use and exploit those compositions. A.7.

Using the Disputed Compositions, Miller created the Album Compositions in collaboration with Blige, Lawrence, Holland and Stinson. Miller admittedly did not disclose to his co-writers that his father had originally authored the Disputed Compositions. A.48.

Miller entered into an exclusive songwriter and co-publishing agreement with Universal Tunes to furnish his songwriting services. He also granted to Universal Tunes one-half of his interests in all musical compositions that he wrote, composed, created, owned, controlled or acquired. Miller delivered his interests in the Album Compositions to Universal Tunes, and along with the other co-owners, issued a mechanical license to MCA Records to permit the exploitation of the Album Compositions.

In 2004, while the Davis lawsuit was pending, Chambliss formalized his prior oral transfers of the Disputed Compositions to Miller by executing written assignments transferring those compositions, thereby fully complying with the formalities of a transfer of copyright ownership under the Act. The written assignments expressly state that they were effective as of the date Chambliss created the Disputed Compositions. A.9-10.

2. The District Court Opinion

On defendants' motion for summary judgment, the district court found a triable issue of fact with respect to the oral transfer of copyrights made by Chambliss to his son. However, in granting summary judgment dismissing the complaint, the district court ruled that "there exists no genuine issue as to the intent of co-author Chambliss to transfer his rights to Miller, nor his realization of this intent in the Written Assignments," A.50, which were a "complete and total assignment." A.52.

The district court explained that "[w]here there is no dispute between transferor and transferee of a copyright as to the validity of the transfer, such a transfer has been consistently upheld. This is the case even where the license or transfer takes place after the institution of an action for copyright infringement and, indeed, even where the plaintiff in the action is the other co-owner of the copyright and the retroactive license or transfer by one co-owner serves to bar the infringement claim of the other co-owner." A.50.

Relying on the well-established principle that a co-owner of a copyright "has a legal right to grant a license in a work without another co-owner's permission or to transfer his rights in the copyright freely," A.52, the district court held that "Davis' status as joint owner with Chambliss, who in turn transferred his interests to Miller, bars her from stating a claim for copyright infringement against Miller, or any of the other defendants, his licensees." A.53.

3. The Court of Appeals Opinion

In vacating the judgment and remanding the case to the district court, the Court of Appeals ruled that an owner of a copyright cannot transfer his ownership interest in a work, or even grant a non-exclusive license to exploit a work, if such action discharges the accrued copyright infringement claim of a co-owner.

However, the central issue on appeal was not whether a copyright owner can issue a retroactive non-exclusive license to settle an infringement claim, but whether there are any restrictions on the rights of a copyright owner to transfer his ownership interest in a work. Pursuant to the Act, its legislative history and prior decisions of this Court, the answer to that questions is "no."

Judicially replacing the statutory scheme governing the rights of co-owners of copyrights with misplaced and inapposite concepts from contract, property, tort and patent law, the Court of Appeals broadly ruled "that a license or assignment in copyright can only act prospectively." A.28. The court below elevated the accrued rights of a co-owner to assert a copyright infringement claim over the right of other co-owners to freely alienate their property. It thus held that a co-owner of copyright cannot independently transfer a copyright interest in a way that would release or settle an accrued claim of copyright infringement.

While the district court found a triable issue of fact whether Chambliss orally assigned to Miller the Disputed Compositions, the Court of Appeals concluded

that even if an oral agreement were reached, it could not be retroactively ratified by a subsequent written agreement if it would discharge an accrued infringement claim of a co-owner. A.36.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. THE COURT SHOULD SAFEGUARD THE FREE AND UNFETTERED ALIENABILITY OF COPYRIGHT AS CREATED BY CONGRESS

The rights afforded to owners of copyright are "wholly statutory" and dependent upon the acts of Congress passed pursuant to the authority conferred under Article I, §8, cl. 8 of the United States Constitution. *Bobbs-Merrill Co. v. Straus*, 210 U.S. 339, 346 (1908). Despite the Court of Appeals' reliance on contract, property and tort concepts, the right of ownership in copyright "does not exist at common law – it originated, if at all, under the acts of congress." *Wheaton v. Peters*, 33 U.S. (8 Pet.) 591, 663-64 (1834). The parameters of the right must be found within the Act itself, for "it is for Congress, not the courts, to decide how best to pursue the Copyright Clause's objectives." *Eldred v. Ashcroft*, 536 U.S. 186, 211 (2003). The disposition of this lawsuit rests solely on the copyright statute as enacted by Congress.

This Court expressly addressed the deference courts should provide to the will of Congress expressed in the Act in *Stewart v. Abend*, 495 U.S. 207, 216 (1990). There, the Court rejected an effort to "read into the Copyright Act a limitation on the statutorily created rights of the owner" concerning the application of

renewal rights to derivative works, finding "no support for such a curtailment of rights" in the Act or its legislative history. *Id.* at 222. The Court of Appeals' "curtailment of rights" of copyright assignment and licensing is likewise an intrusion on the statutorily created rights of copyright owners, which lacks support in the Act and its legislative history.

Two clearly stated principles of the statutory copyright scheme compel reversal of the decision below. First, pursuant to §201(a) of the Act, "authors of a joint work are coowners of copyright in the work." According to the Act's legislative history, co-owners are to be treated "as tenants in common, with each coowner having an independent right to use or license the use of a work, subject to a duty of accounting to the other co-owners for any profits." H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476 at 121 (1976).

Second, as Congress provided in §201(d)(1) of the Act, each owner is free to alienate his or her entire ownership interest: "The ownership of a copyright may be transferred in whole or in part by any means of conveyance or by operation of law. . . ."[2] Where the Act imposes conditions on a copyright owner's freedom to transfer ownership, it does so expressly in the statute. 17 U.S.C. §§106A(e), 203(a)(5), 204(a) and 304(c).

---

2. A copyright transfer is broadly defined as "an assignment, mortgage, exclusive license, or any other conveyance, alienation, or hypothecation of a copyright or of any of the exclusive rights comprised in a copyright." 17 U.S.C. §101.

The Act's legislative history underscores Congress' intent to grant a copyright owner the free and unfettered right to exploit and alienate his property: "The principle of unlimited alienability of copyright is stated in clause (1) of section 201(d)." H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476, 123 (1976); S. Report No. 94-473, 106 (1975). As Professor Nimmer explains: "In the absence of an agreement to the contrary, one joint owner may always transfer his interest in the joint work to a third party, subject only to the general requirements of a valid transfer of copyright." 1 Melvin B. Nimmer & David Nimmer, Nimmer on Copyright §6.11 (2005). Strikingly, while fashioning new rules restricting an owner's freedom to exploit or transfer copyright, the Court of Appeals never discussed §201(d)(1) of the Act or its legislative history.

As noted above, the fundamental principle of co-ownership under the statutory copyright scheme is that co-owners of copyright can freely and independently exploit their joint work, subject only to the duty to account to each other for profits from the exploitation. *Aalmuhammed v. Lee*, 202 F.3d 1227 (9th Cir. 2000); *Thomson v. Larson*, 147 F.3d 195, 199 (2d Cir. 1998). The Court of Appeals, however, has re-set the balance of rights between co-owners from that set by Congress based on a subjective perception that the obligation of joint owners to account to each other from non-exclusive exploitations is an insufficient substitute for the remedies available in an action for copyright infringement. A.34.

Consistent with the congressional intent that co-owners of copyright can act independently to exploit the work, a "joint owner is not required to join his other co-owners in an action for infringement," A.16, *citing* 17 U.S.C. §501(b). An action for copyright infringement is not among the "exclusive rights" of copyright enumerated in §106 of the Act. *Silvers v. Sony Pictures Entertainment*, 402 F.3d 881, 884 (9th Cir. 2005). Exclusive rights of copyright can only be conveyed by all joint owners, A.18-19, because an independent exercise of such rights by one co-owner would impair the value of the copyright.

In addition to judicially amending the statutory right of each co-owner to exploit the work, the Court of Appeals has created a judicial exception to the right of a co-owner to freely alienate his copyright property. It has legislated a new quasi-exclusive right by which a co-owner now has the power to block the other co-owner from alienating his ownership interest, except prospectively. The Court of Appeals rewrites the Act by exalting the right to maintain an action for an accrued infringement claim, a mere "incident of copyright ownership," A.16, over the statutory right to freely alienate a copyright interest.

Until the Court of Appeals ruled that "a license or assignment in copyright can only operate prospectively," A.28, it was widely recognized by the federal courts that a transfer of copyright retroactively conferred standing upon a transferee to pursue an accrued infringement claim if such right was expressly included in the conveyance. *Silvers*, 402 F.3d at 889; *ABKCO Music, Inc. v. Harrisongs, Music, Ltd.*, 944 F.2d 971, 980 (2d Cir. 1991);

Prather v. Neva Paperbacks, Inc., 410 F.2d 698, 699 (5th Cir. 1969). In this case, such a right was conferred in the assignment to Miller. Co-extensive with the right to pursue a claim for infringement is the right to settle or compromise such claims.

Even if the opinion does not interfere with the established right to confer standing to pursue accrued claims, those claims cannot be settled without the consent of all co-owners. Such an anomalous and asymmetrical rule abridges the "unlimited alienability" of copyright granted by Congress, H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476, 123 (1976); S. Report No. 94-473, 106 (1975), and substantially reduces a copyright's value.

Finding no support under the Act or its legislative history, the Court of Appeals extrapolated its holding from common law principles from property and contract law, at least those concepts it recognized. The intangible right of copyright ownership is distinct from real or personal property rights, and is entirely a creature of federal statute. *White-Music Pub. Co. v. Apollo Co.*, 209 U.S. 1, 19 (1908) (Holmes, J. concurring).

The reliance by the Court of Appeals on "the fundamental principle of contract law prohibiting the parties to a contract from binding nonparties," A.27, ignores the fact that Congress created an ownership scheme for copyrights whereby joint owners of copyright may act in numerous ways that bind their co-owners without their consent, including the granting of non-exclusive licenses. A.17, 20; 1 Nimmer at §6.11. Moreover, contract law approves assignments that operate retroactively to validate earlier licenses, *Viacom Int'l*

Inc. v. Tandem Prod., Inc., 526 F.2d 593, 595 (2d Cir. 1975), which precedent was not followed by the Court of Appeals.

The Court of Appeals attempted to bolster its opinion by relying on patent law decisions that permit only prospective licenses and prohibit licenses that defeat actions by co-owners for past infringement. Because there are "such wide differences" between the rights protected by the copyright and patent statutes, this Court has cautioned against reasoning by analogy from the cases decided under one statutory scheme to the other. *Bobbs-Merrill Co.*, 210 U.S. at 345. *Accord: Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc.*, 464 U.S. 417, 439 n. 19 (1984).

While both patent and copyright owners are free to independently exploit their ownership rights, patent co-owners have no duty to account to their co-owners for unilateral exploitations; thus, a patent co-owner who objects to the issuance of a license earns nothing from that grant, unlike a copyright co-owner who is entitled to a *pro rata* share of the proceeds from the license. *Compare Univ. of Colo. Found., Inc. v. American Cyanamid Co.*, 196 F.3d 1366, 1373 (Fed. Cir. 1999) *with Thomson*, 147 F.3d at 199. Furthermore, a patent co-owner cannot file an infringement action without the consent of all co-owners. 35 U.S.C. §262; *Ethicon v. United States Surgical Corp.*, 135 F.3d 1456, 1468 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 525 U.S. 923 (1998); 8 Donald S. Chisum, Chisum on Patents §21.03[3][d] at 21-548-49. In contrast, the Act does not require joinder of all owners to pursue infringement claims. 17 U.S.C. §501(b). Because a patent co-owner is statutorily

prohibited from filing suit without the acquiescence of each co-owner, the possibility of invalidating the accrued infringement claims of a co-owner through a retroactive license or assignment can never arise.

The Court of Appeals based its solicitude for the accrued infringement claims of a copyright co-owner on speculation that the practice approved by the district court and many other courts would encourage infringers to buy their way out of litigation at a discount. A.33-34. As this Court ruled in *New York Times Co., Inc. v. Tasini*, 533 U.S. 483, 505-06 (2001), addressing 17 U.S.C. §201(c), "speculation about future harms is no basis for [the] Court to shrink authorial rights Congress established in sec. 201. . . ."

The commercial realities outweigh the apocryphal dangers envisioned by the Court of Appeals. Many mass media concerns, including the music and motion picture industries, depend on securing licenses and assignments from copyright owners. Prior to the opinion of the Court of Appeals, these industries could obtain a license or assignment from a copyright owner secure in the knowledge that they were insulated from lawsuits by silent co-owners.

Under the regime legislated by the Court of Appeals, an assignment from an undisputed copyright owner provides no assurance that a known or unknown co-owner will not surface to sue for infringement within the three-year statute of limitations. In an industry where works are created by numerous authors and disputes frequently arise as to the number of authors and percentage participation of each, even utmost

diligence and good faith efforts to obtain transfers or licenses from all co-owners will not grant complete protection to transferees or licensees. Indeed, in the interplay of a collaborative creation, an author may not know that a co-author is contributing material that will subsequently be the subject of a claim that it was authored by a stranger to the artistic enterprise.

Empowering one owner with the ability to veto the transfers of a co-owner creates formidable obstacles for the purchasers and distributors of copyrighted works and undermines the constitutional underpinnings of the Act to "promote the Progress of Science and the useful Arts." U.S. Const., art. I, §8, cl.8. It also undermines the policies favoring voluntary settlement of copyright disputes, *see, e.g., ABKCO Music, Inc. v. Harrisongs Music, Ltd.*, 722 F.2d 988, 997 (2d Cir. 1983), eliminating a litigant's incentive to settle a copyright claim if any part of such claim remains viable because of the obstinacy of a copyright co-owner.

II. THE COURT SHOULD SAFEGUARD THE RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF §204(a) OF THE ACT

The Court of Appeals legislated its limitations on free and unfettered alienability into the text of §204(a) of the Act. It ruled that irrespective of the existence or non-existence of a prior oral agreement to transfer a copyright interest, a written transfer can never have retroactive effect if it implicates accrued infringement claims of a non-transferring co-owner of copyright.

The circuit courts have consistently ruled that a transfer of copyright operates retroactively to confer standing, *ABKCO Music*, 944 F.2d 980; *Prather*, *supra*, and to validate prior oral understandings. *Billy-Bob Teeth, Inc. v. Novelty, Inc.*, 329 F.3d 586, 592-93 (7th Cir. 2003); *Magnuson v. Video Yesteryear*, 85 F.3d 1424, 1429-30 (9th Cir. 1996); *Imperial Residential Design, Inc. v. Palms Development Group, Inc.*, 70 F.3d 96, 99 (11th Cir. 1995); *Eden Toys, Inc. v. Florelee Undergarment Co.*, 697 F.2d 27 (2d Cir. 1982).

The "chief purpose of Section 204(a), (like the Statute of Frauds), is to resolve disputes between copyright owners and transferees and to protect copyright holders from persons mistakenly or fraudulently claiming oral licenses or copyright ownership." *Imperial Residential Design*, *supra*. In furtherance of this laudatory statutory goal, the circuit courts have denied challenges to retroactive application of written transfers of copyrights raised by litigants who were not parties to the transfers. *Billy-Bob Teeth*, *supra*; *Magnuson*, *supra*; *Imperial Residential Design*, *supra*; *Eden Toys*, *supra*. These courts ruled that so long as there was no dispute between the transferor and transferee, "it would be unusual and unwarranted" to permit a stranger to the agreement to challenge the transfer. *Billy-Bob Teeth*, *supra*, *quoting Imperial Residential Design*.

The Court of Appeals' opinion impresses an exception on the established operation of §204(a) where the challenge to the transfer is raised by a co-owner with an accrued infringement claim. There is no basis in the statute, legislative history or the judicially-

recognized purpose of the statute for such a sweeping curtailment on the right of owners to transfer copyrights. A non-transferring co-owner is as much a stranger to transfers between willing transferors and transferees as is a third party infringer.

Because all of the owners of copyright may not be known or discoverable at the time of transfer, a rule granting non-transferring owners stealth power to veto copyright transfers that are otherwise valid under §204(a) will render those transfers ephemeral and subject to defeasance. This judge-made rule is contrary to the Act's paramount goal of "enhancing predictability and certainty of copyright ownership." *Cmty. For Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 U.S. 730 (1989). The statutorily-protected right to transfer copyright ownership should not be curtailed by judicial fiat. *Eldred, supra*; *Stewart, supra*; *Bobbs-Merrill Co., supra*; *Wheaton, supra.*

CONCLUSION

The opinion of the Court of Appeals creates great uncertainty and upsets long-settled practices in numerous industries that rely on obtaining transfers or licenses from copyright owners without fear of litigation from co-owners. It constricts the previously free and unfettered right of a joint author to grant copyright transfers or licenses. The Court should grant *certiorari* to guarantee the statutorily-protected rights of copyright owners from unwarranted restraints on alienation that threaten and impede the transfer and exploitation of copyrighted works.

Respectfully submitted,

JONATHAN D. DAVIS
Counsel of Record
JONATHAN D. DAVIS, P.C.
ROBERT P. MULVEY, OF COUNSEL
99 Park Avenue, Suite 1600
New York, New York 10016
(212) 687-5464
Attorneys for Petitioners
Mary J. Blige and
Mary J. Blige Music

ANDREW H. BART
JENNER & BLOCK LLP
919 Third Avenue, 37th Floor
New York, New York 10022
(212) 891-1600
Attorneys for Petitioners Universal Music Group, Inc., Universal Studios, Inc., Universal Music Publishing, Inc., Universal-MCA Music Publishing, a division of Universal Studios, Inc., Universal Music & Video Distribution Corp. and MCA Records, a division of UMG Recordings, Inc.

CYNTHIA S. ARATO
GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10166
(212) 351-4000
Attorneys for Petitioners Warner-Tamerlane Publishing Corp., Dana Stinson and Dayna's Day Publishing

GREGORY J. WATFORD
61 Broadway, Suite 3025
New York, New York 10006
(212) 785-5840
Attorneys for Petitioners
Ronald Lawrence and
Ausar Music Publishing, Ltd.

GEORGE T. GILBERT
100 Fifth Avenue, 11th Floor
New York, New York 10011
(917) 817-4819
Attorney for Petitioner
Bruce Miller

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A — OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT DECIDED OCTOBER 5, 2007

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

(Argued: January 10, 2007 Decided: October 5, 2007)

Docket No. 05-6844-cv

SHARICE DAVIS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

MARY J. BLIGE, BRUCE MILLER, RONALD LAWRENCE, KWAME HOLLAND, DANA STINSON, AUSAR MUSIC, MARY J. BLIGE PUBLISHING, BRUCE MILLER PUBLISHING, KWAME HOLLAND PUBLISHING, MARY J. BLIGE MUSIC, DAYNA S. DAY PUBLISHING, WARNER-TAMERLANE MUSIC PUBLISHING CORP., UNIVERSAL MUSIC GROUP, INC., UNIVERSAL STUDIOS, INC., UNIVERSAL MUSIC PUBLISHING GROUP, UNIVERSAL-MCA MUSIC PUBLISHING, UNIVERSAL MUSIC & VIDEO DISTRIBUTION CORP., and MCA RECORDS, INC.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Before: WINTER and CABRANES, *Circuit Judges*, and KORMAN, *District Judge*.[1]

---

1. The Honorable Edward R. Korman, of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, sitting by designation.

Appendix A

Plaintiff appeals from an order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (Charles S. Haight, Jr., *Judge*) granting defendants' motion for summary judgment on plaintiff's copyright-related claims. The District Court concluded that (1) plaintiff's co-author transferred his rights under copyright to one of the defendants through a written agreement; (2) the transfer, which stated that it was "retroactive" to the date of the creation of the copyright, took effect before the alleged infringement; and (3) the "retroactive" transfer barred plaintiff's claim of infringement against the defendant, who was the beneficiary of the transfer, and his licensees. Plaintiff argues on appeal that the retroactive transfer was invalid and that plaintiff's claims were not barred by the transfer.

Vacated and remanded.

JOSÉ A. CABRANES, *Circuit Judge*:

The question presented, one of first impression in the courts of appeals, is whether an action for infringement by one co-author of a song can be defeated by a "retroactive" transfer of copyright ownership from another co-author to an alleged infringer. This action arises under the current statute governing copyright law, the Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101 *et seq.* ("the Copyright Act"), because "the complaint is [in part] for a remedy expressly granted by [the Copyright Act], e.g., a suit for infringement . . . , [and] asserts a claim requiring construction of [the Copyright Act], . . or, at

the very least ... presents a case where a distinctive policy of [the Copyright Act] requires that federal principles control the disposition of the claim." *T.B. Harms Co. v. Eliscu*, 339 F.2d 823, 828 (2d Cir.1964) (Friendly, J.).

Plaintiff Sharice Davis ("plaintiff" or "Davis") appeals from an order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (Charles S. Haight, Jr., *Judge*) dismissing by summary judgment her claims under the Copyright Act, her claim for a declaratory judgment under 28 U.S.C. § 2201, and her state-law claims alleging unfair competition, unjust enrichment, and violations of New York's consumer protection statutes. *See Davis v. Blige*, 419 F.Supp.2d 493 (S.D.N.Y.2005). The District Court concluded that a "retroactive" written agreement between Bruce Chambliss, Davis's alleged co-author, and Bruce Miller, one of the defendants, purporting to assign Chambliss's rights in two disputed songs as of the time of their creation, was valid. Reasoning that "a co-owner has a legal right to grant a license without another co-owner's permission or transfer his rights in the copyright freely," *id.* at 500, the District Court held that the transfer of co-ownership rights by Chambliss to Miller-who had licensed the copyright to third parties also named as defendants (collectively the "third-party defendants") before the written agreement was executed-defeated Davis's claims not only against Miller but also against the third-party defendants, who were in privity with Miller.

We disagree, and therefore vacate the judgment and remand for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

BACKGROUND

A. Facts

The facts of this case are laid out fully in Judge Haight's opinion. We recount here only those facts relevant to the issues on appeal. Unless otherwise noted, the facts are undisputed.

The dispute between the parties arises from the release in 2001 of an album entitled "No More Drama" ("the Album"). Defendant Mary J. Blige, the "Queen of Hip-Hop Soul," J.A. 325, was the performer on the Album, which achieved "triple platinum" status.[2] Davis alleges that two of the songs contained on the Album—"LOVE" and "Keep It Moving" (collectively, the "Album compositions")—infringe her copyright in two compositions (collectively, the "disputed compositions"). In particular, she claims that "LOVE" is virtually identical to her composition "L.O.V.E.," and that "Keep

---

2. "Platinum" status, a term of art of musical-recording sales certification created by the Recording Industry Association of America, refers to the sale of over one million copies of a musical recording. Thus, "triple platinum" status means over 3 million copies of the Album were sold. *See* Recording Industry Association of America, Gold and Platinum, http://www.riaa.com/goldandplatinum.php (last visited Aug. 8, 2007).

It Moving" bears substantial similarity to her composition "Don't Trade in My Love." Davis does not receive any song-writing credit on the Album; instead, the labels and packaging of the Album identify (1) Blige, Miller, and defendants Kwame Holland and Ronald Lawrence as the authors of "LOVE" and (2) Blige, Miller, Holland, and defendant Dana Stinson as the authors of "Keep It Moving." *See id.* at 495 n. 2.

Davis claims the disputed compositions were co-authored in 1998 by her and Chambliss, Miller's father; Chambliss is not a party to this action. According to one witness, Hunter College Professor Barbara Ottaviani, the disputed composition "L.O.V.E." was written in 1998 during jam sessions in the home of Ottaviani attended by, among others, Davis, Chambliss, and Miller. A tape recording of "L.O.V.E." was made during one of these jam sessions, but the tape disappeared shortly thereafter. At about this time Davis met Blige, who is Miller's sister and the step-daughter of Chambliss. Davis states that she had performed "L.O.V.E." for Blige and that Miller subsequently approached Davis on behalf of Blige, seeking to buy several of Davis's songs, including "L.O.V.E." Davis alleges that she declined the offer. She also alleges that she wrote "Don't Trade in My Love" with Chambliss in or around November 1998 at Ruff Riders Studio.

In August 2001, defendants Ausar Music, Mary J. Blige Publishing, Bruce Miller Publishing, and Kwame Holland Publishing registered "LOVE" and defendant Universal Music MCA Music Publishing, and Blige,

Miller, and Stinson registered "Keep It Moving" with the United States Copyright Office ("Copyright Office"). On February 28, 2002, Miller contracted with Universal Tunes, a division of defendant Universal, Inc., to provide an exclusive license to exploit his copyright interest in the Album compositions as well as his copyright interests in any other compositions not previously assigned to other music publishing companies. On August 14, 2002, Davis registered the disputed compositions with the Copyright Office, listing Chambliss as a co-author. In December 2003, Davis filed suit, alleging infringement of her copyright in the two disputed compositions and a variety of related state claims.

Defendants' April 30, 2003 and August 11, 2003 answers to Davis's complaint denied that anyone other than the defendants listed as authors on the Album wrote the songs. But in depositions given in December 2003 and January 2004 (Miller), and June and August 2004 (Chambliss), both Miller and Chambliss testified that *Chambliss* had initially written the disputed compositions and that they formed the basis for the Album compositions;[3] Chambliss denied ever collaborating on any songs with Davis.[4] Chambliss and

---

3. Miller testified that he and Blige contributed to the "revised" version of "LOVE."

4. Chambliss's deposition testimony is somewhat confused on this point. Although during his deposition he categorically denied ever having written songs with Davis, Chambliss

(Cont'd)

Miller also stated that they had orally agreed Chambliss would grant Miller certain rights in the compositions, although the existence and nature of the alleged oral agreement is in dispute.[5] *See Davis*, 419 F.Supp.2d at

---

(Cont'd)
identified several instances in which Davis's handwriting or name appeared in his papers documenting several songs. Chambliss explained this documentation as either identifying songs meant for her as a performer, or areas where she added unauthorized verses.

5. Miller's and Chambliss's deposition testimony contain inconsistent descriptions of the nature and timing of the alleged oral agreement. Miller stated during his deposition that he and Chambliss had a conversation "[p]robably like the end of '98, '99 . . . somewhere in there," during which Chambliss told him, "basically, 'Any song that I have written, if it needs to be used at any point in time, use it. It is yours.' " Miller said that this agreement was never written down, and that he never compensated Chambliss for any songs that Chambliss had given to him.

According to Chambliss, he "sign[ed] all of [his] songs over to [Miller]" because he "knew [Chambliss] was going to be in prison, and [he] knew [Miller] could handle everything." Chambliss also described the alleged oral agreement alternatively as an agreement that "[Miller] can *use* all of [the songs]." As the District Court noted, however, Chambliss was incarcerated sometime in 1997, and again from 2001 to 2003; thus, it appears that Chambliss could not have known "he was going to be in prison" during late 1998 or early 1999, when Miller says that the oral agreement was reached. *See Davis*, 419 F.Supp.2d at 498. It is also worth noting that it is unclear
(Cont'd)

498 (noting that "a genuine issue exists as to whether Chambliss ever orally transferred his rights in the [disputed] compositions"). On June 23, 2004, one day before Chambliss's initial deposition, Chambliss and Miller allegedly reduced to a writing the transfer of Chambliss's interest in the disputed compositions.[6]

(Cont'd)

whether the oral agreement (assuming *arguendo* that it existed) transferred all of Chambliss's interests in his compositions to Miller, or whether Chambliss merely intended to grant Miller only the right to *use* Chambliss's compositions. Finally, it is unclear whether the alleged agreement related only to the disputed compositions, or whether the agreement related to all of the 3000-4000 compositions that Chambliss claimed to have created.

6. When asked during his first deposition on June 24, 2004, if there was any written agreement memorializing the transfer of his interest to Miller, Chambliss first said "No, he's my son, I don't need a written agreement." But when questioned further, he changed his answer and stated, "Yeah, there is a signed document." When asked about the details of that signed document, Chambliss responded:

> Q. . . . Do you recall what songs were listed on that document?
>
> A. L-O-V — I'm not sure.
>
> Q. Do you remember if there any other songs besides L-O-V-E that were listed?

(Cont'd)

There were two written agreements (collectively, the "transfer agreements"), one for each of the disputed compositions. Each written agreement stated that Chambliss "does hereby sell, assign, transfer, and set

---

(Cont'd)

A. I'm not positive.

Q. Do you know if there were more than five songs listed

A. I'm not positive. . . .

Q. Do you know why [Miller] was asking you to sign that document?

A. Yes.

Q. Why?

A. Because he was trying to sell them [the songs].

Q. Do you know who he was going to try to sell them to?

A. Not right offhand. There was a lot of songs.

The alleged agreement was not made available to Davis, however, until August 8, 2004—the day before Chambliss's *second* deposition—when *two* written agreements transferring Chambliss's rights in the disputed compositions (but no others) to Miller were shown to Davis. The District Court took note that Chambliss's vague testimony during his June 24, 2004 deposition appeared to be inconsistent with the written agreements that he allegedly signed the day before, *see Davis*, 419 F.Supp.2d at 498 ("Chambliss was unable to recall the day, or even the month, in which he executed the written agreement[s], despite the fact that [they are] dated June 23, 2004, the day before the Chambliss deposition was taken"), but nonetheless gave legal effect to the written agreements, *see id.* at 499.

over unto Bruce Miller . . . an undivided one hundred percent (100%) share in and to all the undersigned's right, title and interest" in the respective disputed compositions "and any and all universe-wide copyrights and all renewals, extensions and reversions thereof [and] any and all causes of action for infringement of the same *past, present, and future;* any and all proprietary rights; and all the proceeds from the foregoing accrued and unpaid and hereafter accruing." (emphasis added). According to the transfer agreements, the "instrument of transfer is effective as of the date [Chambliss] first create[d] the above-referenced Composition"—a date not otherwise specified. Defendants claimed that these written agreements merely served to confirm or ratify the prior oral agreement.

B. Procedural History

Davis's complaint alleges that defendants infringed her copyright to the disputed compositions by (1) recording and registering copyrights on "LOVE" and "Keep It Moving," which were substantially similar to her compositions, and (2) falsely attributing authorship to (a) Blige, Miller, Holland, and Lawrence on "LOVE" and (b) Blige, Miller, and Stinson on "Keep It Moving." Davis also alleges that defendants falsely designated the origin of their goods in violation of the Lanham Act § 43(a), 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a);[7] engaged in unfair

---

7. Davis did not respond to defendants' motion for summary judgment on this claim, and does not appeal the resulting dismissal of her Lanham Act § 43(a) claim.

competition; and were unjustly enriched. Finally, she claims that defendants' acts were intentionally designed to mislead the public in violation of N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law §§ 349 and 350.[8]

Following the completion of discovery, defendants moved for summary judgment on the ground that Chambliss had transferred his rights in the disputed compositions to Miller through an oral agreement before the compositions were used by Miller, or, alternatively, on the ground that the written transfer agreements conveyed the copyrights retroactively. *See Davis*, 419 F.Supp.2d at 498-99. Defendants argue that, as a result of the transfer agreements, Miller became a co-owner of the disputed compositions as of the date of the creation of the compositions. Accordingly, they contend that, because Davis cannot sue a co-owner of her copyright for infringement, Davis's suit is barred against Miller and those to whom Miller had licensed the disputed compositions (including Blige and the other defendants).

The District Court agreed. In a memorandum and order filed November 22, 2005, it declined to determine

---

8. N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349 reads in relevant part as follows: "(a) Deceptive acts or practices in the conduct of any business, trade or commerce or in the furnishing of any service in this state are hereby declared unlawful."

N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350 reads in relevant part as follows: "False advertising in the conduct of any business, trade or commerce or in the furnishing of any service in this state is hereby declared unlawful."

whether the written ratification of a prior oral transfer could satisfy the Copyright Act's requirement that transfers of copyright ownership be in writing, 17 U.S.C. § 204(a), or whether the transfer agreements indeed ratified a prior oral agreement between Chambliss and Miller. Instead, it held that Chambliss could "cure past infringement" through the grant of a retroactive assignment of the copyright. *Davis,* 419 F.Supp.2d at 500 (quoting *Silberstein v. Fox Entm't Group, Inc.*, 424 F.Supp.2d 616, 629 (S.D.N.Y.2004)). Because there is no appellate case law on the issue of retroactive assignment of copyright, the District Court relied on other district court opinions, among them *Silberstein,* 424 F.Supp.2d at 629 (holding that a retroactive license, obtained after alleged infringement occurred and after institution of legal action, immunized defendant from infringement); *Country Road Music, Inc. v. MP3.com, Inc.*, 279 F.Supp.2d 325, 329 (S.D.N.Y.2003) (concluding that a settlement agreement between defendants and co-owner granting retroactive reproduction rights barred any infringement claim by remaining co-owners and cured past infringement); and *Lone Wolf McQuade Assocs. v. CBS Inc.* 961 F.Supp. 587, 597 (S.D.N.Y.1997) (stating that a retroactive license cures past infringement). *See Davis,* 419 F.Supp.2d at 499-500. Ultimately, the District Court concluded that, as a result of the written retroactive assignment of rights by Chambliss to Miller, "Davis has no claim for copyright infringement against defendants." *Davis,* 419 F.Supp.2d at 501. Noting that "one joint owner may always transfer his interest in the work to a third party, including the grant of non-exclusive licenses," *id.* at 500 (citing 1 Melvin B. and

David Nimmer, *Nimmer on Copyright* § 6.11 (2005) ("*Nimmer*")), the District Court reasoned that "Davis' [alleged] status as joint owner with Chambliss, who in turn transferred his interests to Miller, bars her from stating a claim for copyright infringement against Miller, or any of the other defendants, [who are] his licensees." *Id.* Davis's timely appeal followed.

DISCUSSION

In reviewing a grant of summary judgment, we draw all factual inferences in favor of the non-moving party and review the matter *de novo*. *See, e.g., Miller v. Wolpoff & Abramson, L.L.P.*, 321 F.3d 292, 300 (2d Cir.2003). Summary judgment is only appropriate where there are no genuine issues of material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. *See, e.g., Kapps v. Wing*, 404 F.3d 105, 112 (2d Cir.2005). Because the District Court's grant of summary judgment was based on its conclusions about the legal effect of the transfer agreements—a matter that our Court has not yet addressed—resolution of the matter before us will depend on our own analysis of the relevant copyright law. *See Larry Spier, Inc. v. Bourne Co.*, 953 F.2d 774, 775 (2d Cir.1992).

The question of whether one joint owner of a copyright can retroactively transfer his ownership by a written instrument, and thereby cut off the accrued rights of the other owner to sue for infringement, is an issue of first impression in the courts of appeals. Although the Copyright Act itself is silent on the issue

of retroactive transfer or license, we conclude that such retroactive transfers violate basic principles of tort and contract law, and undermine the policies embodied by the Copyright Act.

A. General Principles of Copyright Law

We revisit some general principles of copyright law in order to place the instant case in its legal context.

Copyright, of course, is a federal grant of a property interest in the production, replication, publication, and distribution of certain classes of "original works of authorship fixed in any tangible medium of expression," 17 U.S.C. § 102(a), including musical compositions, *Id.* § 102(a)(2).[9] "Copyright in a work protected under [the Copyright Act] thus initially vests in the author or authors of the work." 17 U.S.C. § 201(a). "The authors of a joint work are co[-]owners of copyright in the work," *id.*, and, as described in the House Report accompanying passage of the Copyright Act, are to "be treated generally as tenants in common, with each co[-]owner having an independent right to use or license the use of a work, subject to a duty of accounting to the other co[-]owners for any profits." H.R.Rep. No. 94-1476, at

---

9. The United States Constitution confers on Congress the power "[t]o promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries." U.S. Const. art 1, § 8, cl. 8. In the exercise of that power, Congress regulates copyright of creative works through the Copyright Act.

121 (1976); *see Thomson v. Larson,* 147 F.3d 195, 199 (2d Cir.1998) ("Joint authorship entitles the coauthors to equal undivided interests in the whole work—in other words, each joint author has the right to use or to license the work as he or she wishes, subject only to the obligation to account to the other joint owner for any profits that are made."). We long ago observed that

> [t]he rights of property which the [co-owner] had were transferable by sale and delivery, and there is no distinction, independent of statute, between [copyrighted property] and property of any other description. The right to sell and transfer personal property is an inseparable incident of the property. An author or proprietor of a literary work or manuscript [or other work protected by the Copyright Act] possesses such a right of sale as fully and to the same extent as does the owner of any other piece of personal property. It is an incident of ownership.

Maurel v. Smith, 271 F. 211, 214 (2d Cir.1921).

Like other forms of property ownership, copyright ownership is a "bundle of discrete rights" regarding the owner's ability to use his property. *See Faulkner v. Nat'l Geographic Enters., Inc.,* 409 F.3d 26, 35 (2d Cir.2005) ("The Supreme Court stressed that in enacting the 1976 revision [of the Copyright Act], Congress rejected the doctrine of indivisibility, recasting the copyright as a bundle of discrete exclusive rights, 17 U.S.C. § 106 (1994

ed. and Supp. V), each of which may be transferred ... and owned separately, § 201(d)(2)." (quoting *New York Times v. Tasini,* 533 U.S. 483, 495-96, 121 S.Ct. 2381, 150 L.Ed.2d 500 (2001)) (internal quotation marks omitted)). These rights include "reproduc[ing,]" "prepar[ing] derivative works," "distribut[ing,]" "perform[ing,]" or "display[ing]" a creative work. 17 U.S.C. § 106. Owners may license others to exercise these rights or assign the rights to others. *T.B. Harms,* 339 F.2d at 825. In addition, an owner may sue for infringement those who exploit the creative work without permission or assignment. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 501(b) ("The legal or beneficial owner of an exclusive right under a copyright is entitled . . . to institute an action for any infringement of that particular right committed while he or she is the owner of it."); *Knickerbocker Toy Co., Inc. v. Azrak-Hamway Int'l., Inc.,* 668 F.2d 699, 702 (2d Cir.1982) (stating that "[t]o prevail on a claim of copyright infringement, a plaintiff must show both ownership of a valid copyright and copying").

The right to prosecute an accrued cause of action for infringement is also an incident of copyright ownership. *ABKCO Music, Inc. v. Harrisongs Music, Ltd.,* 944 F.2d 971, 980 (2d Cir.1991). Moreover, it is a right that may be exercised independently of co-owners; a joint owner is not required to join his other co-owners in an action for infringement. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 501(b) (noting that a court "*may* require" an owner of a copyright to serve notice on a person who is shown "to have or claim an interest in the copyright" and "*may*

require the joinder . . . of any person having or claiming an interest in the copyright") (emphasis added); *Edward Marks Music Corp. v. Jerry Vogel Music Co.*, 140 F.2d 268, 269 (2d Cir.1944) ("It was early decided that the holder of the legal title to a copyright might sue without joining others who had an equitable interest in the copyright."); *Copyright.net Music Publ'g LLC v. MP3.com*, 256 F.Supp.2d 214, 218 (S.D.N.Y.2003) (holding that copyright infringement plaintiffs were not obligated to join alleged co-owners of compositions at issue).

Early in the twentieth century, we stated in the copyright context the venerable principle of the law of property that, while an owner may convey any of his rights to others permanently or temporarily, he may not convey more than he owns. *Maurel*, 271 F. at 215 ("[W]hen the [co-owners] granted rights to [a music publisher], they could but transmit what they had to part with, and they could not transfer what interest the [other co-owner] had."); *see also Filmvideo Releasing Corp. v. Hastings*, 668 F.2d 91, 93 (2d Cir.1981) ("[T]he proprietor of a derivative copyright cannot convey away that which he does not own. . . ."). Accordingly, an owner may give a license to someone to exploit the work in some way, provided he owns that particular copyright interest. 17 U.S.C. § 106. An owner may also convey his interest in prosecuting accrued causes of action for infringement. *ABKCO Music*, 944 F.2d at 980; *see also Prather v. Neva Paperbacks, Inc.*, 410 F.2d 698, 700 (5th Cir.1969) (noting the effectiveness of an assignment of accrued causes of action for copyright infringement).

An owner may not, however, convey the interests of his fellow co-owners without their express written consent, even if the transferee has no notice of the non-consenting owners' interest. *See Crosney v. Edward Small Productions*, 52 F.Supp. 559, 561 (S.D.N.Y.1942) ("One [co-owner of a copyright] cannot bind the interest of another, although he purports to do so, in the absence of assent or ratification upon her part." (internal quotation marks omitted)). A co-owner's ability to grant licenses to third parties unilaterally will therefore depend on the type of licenses granted. There are two general categories of licenses: non-exclusive licenses, which permit licensees to use the copyrighted material and may be granted to multiple licensees; and exclusive licenses, which grant to the licensee the exclusive right—superior even to copyright owners' rights—to use the copyrighted material in a manner as specified by the license agreement.[10] A valid license of either sort

---

10. Under current copyright law, exclusive licenses are recognized as a type of an ownership interest, conveying a particular exclusive right of copyright. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 101 (" 'Copyright owner', with respect to any one of the exclusive rights comprised in a copyright, refers to the owner of that particular right."). Exclusive licensees may sue without joining the copyright owners, 17 U.S.C. § 501, and exclusive license agreements must be in writing, 17 U.S.C. § 204(a); *see also Eden Toys, Inc. v. Florelee Undergarment Co.*, 697 F.2d 27, 36 (2d Cir.1982). The differences between an "exclusive" license and an assignment or transfer of copyright ownership interest have diminished to the point that the terms are nearly synonymous. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 101 ("A 'transfer of copyright ownership' is an assignment, mortgage, exclusive license, or any other

(Cont'd)

immunizes the licensee from a charge of copyright infringement, provided that the licensee uses the copyright as agreed with the licensor. *See Graham v. James*, 144 F.3d 229, 236 (2d Cir.1998) ("A copyright owner who grants a nonexclusive license to use his copyrighted material waives his right to sue the licensee for copyright infringement."); *United States Naval Institute v. Charter Commc'ns, Inc.*, 936 F.2d 692, 695 (2d Cir.1991) ("[A]n exclusive licensee of any of the rights comprised in the copyright, though it is capable of breaching the contractual obligations imposed on it by

---

(Cont'd)

conveyance . . . of a copyright or any of the exclusive rights comprised in a copyright, whether or not it is limited in time or place of effect, but not including a nonexclusive license."). However, although it is possible to share ownership of a copyright interest as co-owners, an exclusive licensee of an interest is the only one who may exercise that right. "Each author's rights in a joint work are non-exclusive, whereas a sole author retains exclusive rights in his or her own work." *Thomson*, 147 F.3d at 205 (internal citations omitted). Therefore, in order to convey exclusive rights, all co-owners must agree to convey their shares of the same right.

Under the earlier version of the copyright statute, the Copyright Act of 1909, copyright ownership was generally considered indivisible; thus, the individual rights comprising the bundle of copyright property rights could not be separately assigned, and exclusive licenses granted more limited rights-for example, exclusive licensees had to join copyright owners in suits for infringement. Apparently, because exclusive licenses were not transfers of ownership, oral agreements granting exclusive licenses were permissible. *See* 3 *Nimmer* § 10.01[C].

the license, cannot be liable for infringing the copyright rights conveyed to it."); *see also McKay v. Columbia Broad. Sys. Inc.*, 324 F.2d 762, 763 (2d Cir.1963) ("[A] license from a co-holder of a copyright immunizes the licensee from liability to the other co-holder for copyright infringement.").

A co-owner may grant a *non-exclusive* license to use the work unilaterally, because his co-owners may also use the work or grant similar licenses to other users and because the non-exclusive license presumptively does not diminish the value of the copyright to the co-owners. *See Meredith v. Smith,* 145 F.2d 620, 621 (9th Cir.1944) (noting that a "co-owner had the right to give permission" for nonexclusive use of a copyrighted work); 1 *Nimmer* § 6.10[A], 6-34. In any event, a co-owner who grants a non-exclusive license is accountable to his co-owner for income gained by the grant of the license. *Shapiro, Bernstein & Co. v. Jerry Vogel Music Co.*, 223 F.2d 252, 254 (2d Cir.1955). However, a licensee is not liable to a non-licensing co-owner for use authorized by the license, because the licensee's rights rest on the license conveyed by the licensing co-owner. *See McKay* 324 F.2d at 763. Likewise, a licensee need not pay any royalties or other consideration to the co-owners who are not parties to the license agreement. *See Piantadosi v. Loew's, Inc.*, 137 F.2d 534, 537 (9th Cir.1943) (holding that a third party granted a non-exclusive copyright license by one co-owner had no duty to the other co-owner); 1 *Nimmer* § 6.12(c)(3). A non-exclusive license conveys no ownership interest, and the holder of a nonexclusive license may not sue others for

infringement. *See Eden Toys*, 697 F.2d at 32 ("The Copyright Act authorizes only two types of claimants to sue for copyright infringement: (1) owners of copyrights, and (2) persons who have been granted exclusive licenses by owners of copyrights."). An exclusive license, on the other hand, conveys an ownership interest. *See Campbell v. Trustees of Stanford University*, 817 F.2d 499, 504 (9th Cir.1987). Accordingly an exclusive licensee may sue others for infringement, including the licensor if the licensor infringes on the exclusive right he granted the licensee. *See U.S. Naval Institute*, 936 F.2d at 695 (citing 3 *Nimmer* § 12.02). Because no one other than the exclusive licensee may exercise the right specified by the exclusive license agreement, the interests of the other co-owners to use or grant non-exclusive licenses to the work are necessarily impaired. An exclusive license thus destroys the value of a copyright to the copyright owners, to the extent that the licensed rights cannot be used or exploited by the copyright owners. Unlike a transfer of one co-owner's copyright interest to another person, which conveys only the co-owner's share of that interest, an exclusive license grants all co-owners' shares of a particular copyright interest to the exclusive licensee. Accordingly, a co-owner cannot unilaterally grant an exclusive license. *See Maurel*, 271 F. at 216 ("Where two or more persons have a common interest in a property, equity will not allow one to appropriate it exclusively to himself, or to impair its worth as to others."); 1 *Nimmer* § 6.11 (noting prohibition on one co-owner granting an exclusive license without consent of other co-owners).

B. Retroactive Licenses and Transfers Are Invalid

In this case, we deal with the question of whether a copyright co-owner—who, according to the legislative history of the Copyright Act, we are to treat as a tenant in common, *see ante* page 98—can convey his copyright interest to a third party retroactively, thereby defeating a claim of infringement asserted against that third party by another co-owner. In *Eden Toys*, we held that a later writing could memorialize or confirm an earlier oral agreement. *Eden Toys*, 697 F.2d at 36. The District Court in the instant case concluded that "a reasonable jury could find an oral agreement never existed between Chambliss and Miller." *Davis*, 419 F.Supp.2d at 498. Still, the District Court agreed with defendants that "the written agreements would nonetheless be valid to defeat Davis' claims." *Id.* at 499. Relying on several district court decisions holding that retroactive licenses are permissible and enforceable, *see ante* pages 8-9, it concluded that the written agreements between Chambliss and Miller were sufficient to defeat Davis's claims.

We conclude that the district court decisions relied upon by the District Court are distinguishable from the instant case insofar as they involved retroactive licenses granted pursuant to negotiated settlements of accrued infringement claims. *See, e.g., Country Road Music*, 279 F.Supp.2d at 328 (agreeing with defendant that "a settlement agreement between [defendant and co-owner] granted defendant retroactive reproduction rights that bar any infringement claim by plaintiffs

[co-owners]"); *SBK Catalogue P'ship v. Orion Pictures Corp.*, 723 F.Supp. 1053, 1059 (D.N.J.1989) ("The [settlement] agreement contemplated a retroactive written license for the use of the musical composition . . . ."); *Lone Wolf McQuade*, 961 F.Supp. at 590 ("In a settlement agreement dated December 9, 1996, [co-owner] granted [defendant] a retroactive license from January 1, 1990."). Indeed, to the extent that the district courts deciding these cases state the rationale of their legal conclusions, they uphold the agreements as private contracts between two parties without examining the implications for other holders of the copyright, other than to say in a conclusory fashion that these agreements will have the effect of barring infringement claims by third-parties, including co-owners. *See, e.g.*, *Country Road Music*, 279 F.Supp.2d at 329 ("[A] license from a co-holder of a copyright immunizes the licencee from liability to the other co-holder for copyright infringement.") (quoting *McKay*, 324 F.2d at 763).

We believe that reliance on cases involving settlements is misplaced. Licenses and assignments function differently from settlements and releases, and the use of the term "retroactive license" for "settlement" or "release" by the parties causes unnecessary confusion and potentially creates legal mischief. Settlements are generally retrospective and exclusively between the parties to the settlement—the unauthorized user and the owner; and, absent clear language to the contrary, they are not licenses for future use. The Seventh Circuit has aptly observed that "[a] settlement agreement [is] nothing more than a

promise by [one party] to pay liquidated damages for past infringements in return for a dismissal of the infringement suit. [The party] erroneously equates a settlement for past infringement with a license for prospective use. . . ." *Ransburg Electro-coating Corp. v. Spiller & Spiller, Inc.*, 489 F.2d 974, 977 (7th Cir.1973); *see also Birdsell v. Shaliol*, 112 U.S. 485, 487, 5 S.Ct. 244, 28 L.Ed. 768 (1884) ("[A]n infringer does not, by paying damages for making and using a machine in infringement of a patent, acquire any right himself to the future use of the machine. On the contrary, he may, in addition to the payment of damages for past infringement, be restrained . . . from further use. . . ."); *United States v. Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.*, 171 F.2d 103, 111 (6th Cir.1948) ("A release for wrongs done in the past is not the equivalent of a license to do rightfully the same thing in the future.") (quoting *Raytheon Mfg. Co. v. Radio Corp. of America*, 286 Mass. 84, 190 N.E. 1, 5 (1934)). A settlement agreement between an injured owner and an injuring non-owner recognizes the unauthorized use while providing a remedy to the injured owner that is acceptable to all parties to the agreement.

A settlement agreement can only waive or extinguish claims held by a settling owner; it can have no effect on co-owners who are not parties to the settlement agreement. It is a venerable principle of New York co-tenancy law, for example, that "[o]ne tenant in common can settle for or release his interest in . . . personal property, but he cannot settle for or release the interest of his co-tenants. If one tenant in common

should settle for his portion of the damages before action, the other may sue without joining him." *Jackson v. Moore,* 94 A.D. 504, 87 N.Y.S. 1101, 1103 (1904); *see also Wagman v. Carmel,* 601 F.Supp. 1012, 1015 (E.D.Pa.1985) ("Ordinarily, although a tenant in common may freely sell or otherwise dispose of his own interest in jointly held property, he may not act so as to prejudice the rights of his co-tenants. For example, a tenant in common may not unilaterally bind his co-tenants to an agreement concerning the use, control, or title to the joint property."). "[S]ettlement agreements are 'not to be used as a device by which A and B, the parties to the decree, can (just because a judge is willing to give the parties' deal a judicial imprimatur) take away the legal rights of C, a nonparty.' " *Bacon v. City of Richmond,* 475 F.3d 633, 643 (4th Cir.2007) (quoting *United States v. Bd. of Educ. of Chicago,* 11 F.3d 668, 673 (7th Cir.1993)).

Licenses and assignments, however, are prospective; they permit use by a non-owner who would not otherwise have a right to use the property. "In its simplest form, a license means only leave to do a thing which the licensor would otherwise have a right to prevent." *Western Elec. Co. v. Pacent Reproducer Corp.,* 42 F.2d 116, 118 (2d Cir.1930). A retroactive license or assignment purports to authorize a past use that was originally unauthorized. Unlike a settlement, which recognizes an unauthorized use but waives a settling owner's accrued claims of liability, a retroactive license or assignment would—if given legal effect—erase—the unauthorized use from history with the result that the nonparty co-owner's

right to sue for infringement, which accrues when the infringement first occurs, is extinguished. This is the effect of the District Court's decision in this case.

The co-owner's right that would be extinguished by a rule permitting retroactive licenses or assignments—the right to sue for infringement—is a valuable one; indeed, it is one of the most valuable "sticks" of the "bundle of rights" of copyright. *See Silvers v. Sony Pictures Entm't, Inc.*, 402 F.3d 881, 890 n. 1 (9th Cir.2005) ("[T]o receive maximum value for the impaired copyright, one must also convey the right to recover the value of the impairment by instituting a copyright action."). Accordingly, we must examine carefully whether retroactive licenses and assignments that extinguish a co-owner's accrued right to sue are consistent with the general principles of tort[11] and contract law that underlie the accrual and settlement of infringement claims.

As we have observed, "[u]nder general principles of [tort] law, a cause of action accrues when conduct that invades the rights of another has caused injury. When the injury occurs, the injured party has the right to bring

---

11. Infringement has long been recognized as a tort. *See Ted Browne Music Co. v. Fowler*, 290 F. 751, 754 (2d Cir.1923) ("Courts have long recognized that infringement of a copyright is a tort."); *see also Screen Gems-Columbia Music, Inc. v. Metlis & Lebow Corp.*, 453 F.2d 552, 554 (2d Cir.1972) ("Copyright infringement is in the nature of a tort, for which all who participate in the infringement are jointly and severally liable.").

suit for all of the damages, past, present and future, caused by the defendant's acts." *Leonhard v. United States*, 633 F.2d 599, 613 (2d Cir.1980) (citing Restatement (Second) of Torts §§ 899, 910 (1977)). A "retroactive" assignment or license that extinguishes the accrued infringement claims of a non-consenting co-owner by traveling back in time to "undo" an unlawful infringement destroys the co-owner's valuable *and vested* right to enforce her claim.

A retroactive license or assignment that purports to eliminate the accrued causes of action for infringement held by a co-owner who is not party to the license or agreement also violates the fundamental principle of contract law prohibiting the parties to a contract from binding nonparties. *See, e.g., EEOC v. Waffle House, Inc.*, 534 U.S. 279, 294, 122 S.Ct. 754, 151 L.Ed.2d 755 (2002) ("It goes without saying that a contract cannot bind a nonparty."). Moreover, a co-owner who purports to convey not only his right to prosecute past infringements but also his co-owners' right to prosecute past infringements violates the basic rule that an owner cannot convey more than he owns. *See Roy Export Co. Establishment v. Columbia Broad. Sys., Inc.*, 503 F.Supp. 1137, 1153 (S.D.N.Y.1980) ("[I]t is axiomatic that no one can convey more than his own interest in a work."). We have no doubt that Chambliss can release his own accrued claims of copyright infringement against Miller and his fellow defendants, either orally or in writing. But we know of no authority to sanction his attempt to release any rights Davis has against Miller, for they are not Chambliss's to release.

None of what we say above should be read as preventing an owner and an infringer from settling infringement claims among themselves. *See ABKCO Music, Inc. v. Harrisongs Music, Ltd.*, 722 F.2d 988, 997 (2d Cir.1983) (noting in a copyright infringement case, that "courts favor the policy of encouraging voluntary settlement of disputes"); *see also In re Tamoxifen Citrate Antitrust Litig.*, 466 F.3d 187, 203 (2d Cir.2006) ("The general policy of the law is to favor the settlement of litigation, and the policy extends to the settlement of patent infringement suits." (quoting *Asahi Glass Co. v. Pentech Pharms., Inc.*, 289 F.Supp.2d 986, 991 (N.D.Ill.2003) (Posner, J., sitting by designation))). An owner who wishes to release unilaterally his own accrued claims may do so using whatever language he chooses—including by calling the negotiated settlement the proverbial "banana"—but such an agreement cannot have the effect of eviscerating a co-owner's claims based on past copyright infringement, nor can it settle accrued claims held by co-owners who are not themselves parties to the agreement. Accordingly, we hold that a license or assignment in copyright can only act prospectively.

We find support for this holding in the law of patents. Although patent and copyright law function somewhat differently, courts considering one have historically looked to the other for guidance where precedent is lacking. *See Sony Corp. of Am. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.*, 464 U.S. 417, 439, 104 S.Ct. 774, 78 L.Ed.2d 574 (1984) (referring to the "historic kinship between patent law and copyright law" when looking at

patent law to understand vicarious liability in copyright). Our holding in this case is consistent with the law of patents. *See Schering Corp. v. Roussel-UCLAF SA*, 104 F.3d 341, 345 (Fed.Cir.1997) ("[T]he grant of a license by one co-owner cannot deprive the other co-owner of the right to sue for accrued damages for past infringement. That would require a release, not a license, and the rights of a patent co-owner, absent agreement to the contrary, do not extend to granting a release that would defeat an action by other co-owners to recover damages for past infringement."). The prospective nature of licenses has long been recognized in the law of patents. *See, e.g., Waterloo Furniture Components, Ltd. v. Haworth, Inc.*, 467 F.3d 641, 647 (7th Cir.2006) ("Courts have recognized the prospective quality of a patent license, which allows another party to use the patentee's property in the future without fear of suit."); *see also Wang Labs., Inc. v. Oki Elec. Indus. Co.*, 15 F.Supp.2d 166, 172 (D.Mass.1998) (noting that "there is authority to the effect that the concepts of both royalty and license are necessarily prospective, rendering a 'retroactive royalty agreement' a legal nullity"). Licenses in patent and copyright function similarly, *see Harris v. Emus Records Corp.*, 734 F.2d 1329, 1333 (9th Cir.1984), and thus it is appropriate to consider copyright licensing, like patent licensing, prospective in nature. We see no reason why this principle should not also apply to the assignments of the type at issue here.

There is little from a policy perspective to recommend a rule that allows retroactive licenses or assignments, and there are two strong reasons

disfavoring them—(1) the need for predictability and certainty and (2) discouragement of infringement. A rule permitting retroactive assignments and transfers would inject uncertainty and unpredictability into copyright ownership, contrary to the intent of Congress in enacting the Copyright Act of 1976. *See, e.g., Cmty. for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 U.S. 730, 749, 109 S.Ct. 2166, 104 L.Ed.2d 811 (1989) (declaring that "Congress' paramount goal in revising the 1976 Act [was] enhancing predictability and certainty of copyright ownership"); *In re Cybernetic Servs. Inc.*, 252 F.3d 1039, 1056 (9th Cir.2001) ("[F]ederal copyright laws ensure predictability and certainty of copyright ownership . . . .") (quoting *In re Peregrine Entm't, Ltd.*, 116 B.R. 194, 199 (C.D.Cal.1990)). It would also damage, if not extinguish, the "principal purpose" of the Copyright Act, which is "to encourage the origination of creative works by attaching enforceable property rights to them." *Diamond v. Am-Law Publ'g Corp.*, 745 F.2d 142, 147 (2d Cir.1984); *see also Veeck v. S. Bldg. Code Congress Int'l Inc.*, 241 F.3d 398, 402 (5th Cir.2001) ("The core purpose of copyright law is 'to secure a fair return for an author's creative labor' and thereby 'to stimulate artistic creativity for the general public good.' ") (quoting *Twentieth Century Music Corp. v. Aiken*, 422 U.S. 151, 156, 95 S.Ct. 2040, 45 L.Ed.2d 84 (1975)). If retroactive transfers and licenses were permissible, one could never reliably and definitively determine if and when an infringement occurred, because an infringement could be "undone" by the very sort of maneuver attempted by defendants in this case. *See Venegas-Hernandez v. Asociación De Compositores y Editores de Música*

Latinoamericana, 424 F.3d 50, 60 (1st Cir.2005) ("Fitting agency concepts like 'retroactive authorization' into copyright law provides plenty of room for debate; obviously a license in 1998 did not 'cause' a 1993 infringement.").[12] Similarly, one could never know who the pool of authorized users or licensors of a copyright would be at any given time, because a retroactive transfer could always turn an infringer into a potential user or licensor, who would then have the ability to grant his own retroactive licenses or retransfer his new (retroactive) interest retroactively.

This case demonstrates why permitting such an indeterminate legal regime could create substantial mischief. Construing the facts in a light most favorable to Davis, as we are required to do in the case of a summary judgment, Miller had no right to use or license the disputed compositions at the time they were used on the Album or at the time he licensed them to the third-party defendants. The third-party defendants are, in turn, potentially liable for infringement to Davis because they never obtained a legitimate right to use the disputed compositions.[13] If Chambliss were permitted

---

12. *Venegas-Hernandez* had no occasion to address the retroactivity issue—what it described as a "recherché area of copyright law," *id.*—because the party seeking to benefit from a retroactive license in that case did not adequately pursue it.

13. Miller could be exposed to liability under a theory of contributory infringement or for unauthorized licensing of the disputed compositions even if he himself had not used the

(Cont'd)

(Cont'd)
disputed compositions without authorization. While an owner of a copyright may assign an expectancy of a renewal interest in that copyright validly, *see Fred Fisher Music Co. v. M. Witmark & Sons*, 318 U.S. 643, 656-57, 63 S.Ct. 773, 87 L.Ed. 1055 (1943) (holding that an assignment of renewal rights in advance of the owner securing the right to renew was valid), one who grants a license without holding any interest in the copyright at the time the license is granted is differently situated because he purports to exercise a right he does not-and cannot-possess without the consent of the copyright owner. Thus, the unauthorized licensor may be liable for infringement committed by his unauthorized licencees under a theory of contributory infringement as "one who, with knowledge of the infringing activity, induces, causes or materially contributes to the infringing conduct of another." *Gershwin Publ'g Corp. v. Columbia Artists Mgmt., Inc.*, 443 F.2d 1159, 1162 (2d Cir.1971) (footnote omitted); *see also Sony Corp.*, 464 U.S. at 435, 104 S.Ct. 774 (recognizing theory of contributory infringement); *CoStar Group, Inc. v. LoopNet, Inc.*, 373 F.3d 544, 550 (4th Cir.2004) (discussing theory of contributory infringement). The unauthorized licensor also arguably "violates ... the exclusive rights of the copyright owner," 17 U.S.C. § 501(a), "to authorize" who may use the copyright, 17 U.S.C. § 106. *But cf. Venegas-Hernandez*, 424 F.3d at 57-59 (holding that an unauthorized licensor is not liable for copyright infringement absent evidence that the unauthorized licensees actually infringed the copyright).

In any event, Miller would have exceeded his authority as a co-owner to the extent he granted a third-party an exclusive license to the disputed compositions, because he did not join Davis to the licensing agreement. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 201(d)(2); 1 *Nimmer* § 6.11 (noting prohibition on one co-owner granting an exclusive license without consent of co-owners).

to assign his interest in the disputed compositions retroactively, Davis's infringement claims would fail not only against Miller (because Miller would be "retroactively authorized" to use the compositions as a co-owner), but also against the third-party defendants, whose illegitimate licenses would retroactively become legitimate because Miller (by operation of the legal fiction of retroactivity) would now have been authorized as a co-owner to grant third parties the right to use the disputed compositions. Thus, Chambliss's alleged retroactive assignment to Miller of the disputed compositions, for consideration of one dollar each, would have the effect of unraveling valuable accrued infringement claims against not only the retroactive assignee (Miller) but also his licensees.[14]

The second policy reason disfavoring retroactive copyright transfers and licenses that extinguish the right of other co-owners is that such retroactive activity lowers the cost of infringement to infringers, thus making infringement more attractive. An infringer could "buy" his way out of an infringement suit, in which an injured owner may seek enhanced statutory damages and costs, *see* 17 U.S.C. § 504, by paying a single

---

14. We note that were we to permit retroactive transfers of copyright interests in these circumstances, infringers who obtained a retroactive transfer of a copyright interest could not only grant retroactive licenses but also sue *other* past infringers of the copyright. These retroactive co-owners could then issue retroactive licenses to these other past infringers, thwarting yet other potential infringement suits by a non-licensing co-owner.

co-owner for a license or assigned copyright interest. A retroactive license or assignment that can be obtained from a co-owner not bringing suit, or one willing to settle for a lower price than the co-owner bringing the action, is likely to cost much less than the value of the copyright interest including the cost of litigation. The result is that infringement is encouraged and rewarded. This economic incentive to infringe runs directly counter to the intent of Congress in passing 17 U.S.C. § 504—namely to "compensate the copyright owner for losses from the infringement, and . . . to prevent the infringer from unfairly benefitting from a wrongful act." *Abeshouse v. Ultragraphics, Inc.*, 754 F.2d 467, 470 (2d Cir.1985) (quoting H.R.Rep. No. 94-1476, at 161).[15]

---

15. If the retroactive agreement were given effect, the possibility that Davis could seek an accounting from Miller, *see Shapiro, Bernstein & Co. v. Jerry Vogel Music Co.*, 221 F.2d 569, 571 (2d Cir.1955) ("*Shapiro I*"), *modified*, 223 F.2d 252, 254 (2d Cir.1955) ("*Shapiro II*") ("[E]ach holder of the . . . copyright should account to the other for his exploitation thereof[ ]—not as an infringer but as a trustee."), would be an inadequate substitute for Davis's accrued infringement claims. If Davis retained her accrued infringement claims, in order to obtain damages and profits from defendants she would only need to prove defendants' gross revenues from the disputed compositions; the burden would then shift to defendants to prove that their profits were less than their gross revenues. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 504(b) ("[T]he copyright owner is required to present proof only of the infringer's gross revenue, and the infringer is required to prove his or her deductible expenses and the elements of profit attributable to factors other than the copyrighted work."). Davis would also be able to elect statutory

(Cont'd)

For the reasons stated above, we conclude that the written transfer agreements, through which Chambliss allegedly transferred his interests in the disputed compositions to Miller, cannot extinguish Davis's accrued infringement claims against any of the defendants. On remand, the District Court shall adjudicate Davis's infringement claims without giving effect to the purported retroactive assignment of Chambliss's interest in the disputed compositions.[16]

We now turn to address defendants' alternative argument regarding ratification. Miller argued before the District Court that Chambliss transferred his interests in the disputed compositions (and potentially

---

(Cont'd)

damages "at any time before final judgment is rendered." *Id.* § 504(c)(1). Were Davis to only have an accounting remedy against Miller, however, she would be unable to elect statutory damages; she would bear the full burden of proof in demonstrating Miller's profits from the licensing of the disputed compositions; and she would only be entitled to an "equitable share" of Miller's profits, *Shapiro I*, 221 F.2d at 571, rather than all of the profits. Moreover, if Davis were limited to an accounting remedy against Miller, she would be unable to recoup either profits obtained by the third-party defendants as a result of their unauthorized use of the disputed compositions, or her own damages as a result of that unauthorized use.

16. We express no opinion on whether the transfer agreements should be given prospective effect, or—if they are given prospective effect—whether the transfer agreements would limit Davis's remedies against the third-party defendants.

other compositions) to Miller in 1998 or early 1999, in an alleged oral agreement, before the alleged infringement occurred. Miller and his co-defendants acknowledged that the Copyright Act requires all transfer agreements—including assignments—to be in writing, *see* 17 U.S.C. § 204(a), but argued that the transfer agreements ratified the earlier oral agreement. *See Davis*, 419 F.Supp.2d at 497-98. Because the District Court found that "a genuine issue exists as to whether Chambliss ever orally transferred his rights in the [disputed c]ompositions to Miller," the District Court did not "consider whether the [transfer a]greements [were] sufficient to satisfy the writing requirement [of the Copyright Act] as a written ratification of a prior oral transfer." *Id.* at 498.

We conclude that, even if an oral agreement assigning Chambliss's copyright in the disputed compositions to Miller was reached in 1998 or 1999, the oral agreement cannot be "ratified" retroactively by the 2004 transfer agreements to defeat Davis's accrued infringement claims. This is so for the same reasons we cannot give the transfer agreements themselves retroactive effect. If there was no written agreement between Miller and Chambliss documenting the alleged assignment at the time the disputed compositions were used by defendants, defendants had no legal right to use the disputed compositions,[17] and Davis's right to sue

17. The following discussion assumes that Davis proves at trial that she holds copyright in the disputed compositions, and that the Album compositions infringed her copyright in the disputed compositions.

for infringement accrued. Chambliss and Miller could not extinguish Davis's accrued infringement claims by "ratifying" an earlier oral agreement that had no legal effect at the time it was made, because doing so would require us to employ a legal fiction—treating the transfer agreements as if they were written in 1998 or 1999, rather than 2004—to obtain a counterintuitive and inequitable result.

Our opinion in *Eden Toys* is readily distinguishable from the facts of the instant case. In *Eden Toys*, we held that a third-party infringer could not assert the invalidity of an alleged 1975 oral agreement for an exclusive license, which was allegedly memorialized in a 1980 writing, to defeat an infringement claim brought by the exclusive licensee. *See Eden Toys*, 697 F.2d at 36-37. We first noted that the alleged oral agreement was valid at the time it was made, *see id.* at 36 (noting that "[u]nder the pre-1978 copyright law, exclusive licenses could be granted orally or by conduct"). We then held that, because the purpose of the writing requirement in the Copyright Act of 1976 was "to protect copyright holders from persons mistakenly or fraudulently claiming oral licenses . . . [where] the copyright holder appears to have no dispute with its licensee on this matter, it would be anomalous to permit a third party infringer to invoke this provision against the licensee." *Id.*

In this case, however, the "third party" is a copyright holder who *does* have a dispute with the alleged licensee or transferee and who would stand to lose her accrued rights to sue for infringement if an allegedly fraudulent

oral agreement were given legal effect. Thus it would be anomalous *not* to let Davis invoke § 204(a) in support of her infringement claims. Even if a third-party infringer cannot, under *Eden Toys,* contest the validity of an oral transfer agreement under pre-1978 copyright law that is later confirmed in writing, *see Magnuson v. Video Yesteryear,* 85 F.3d 1424, 1429 (9th Cir.1996) (stating that "[t]he logic of *Eden Toys* is particularly compelling in this case" and holding that a third-party infringer could not assert as a defense to an infringement claim the alleged invalidity of an oral transfer agreement that was later confirmed in writing); *Billy-Bob Teeth, Inc. v. Novelty, Inc.,* 329 F.3d 586, 592 (7th Cir.2003) (holding that a third-party infringer lacked "standing" to contest the validity of an oral assignment that was later confirmed in writing), we do not read *Eden Toys* to foreclose a presumed copyright holder (Davis) from using the invalidity of an alleged oral transfer agreement to *defeat an infringer*'s effort to avoid liability for accrued infringement claims.[18]

---

18. Because we hold that a written confirmation of an earlier oral transfer agreement cannot extinguish a copyright owner's accrued infringement claims, we need not decide whether there ought to be, as a general rule, any other limitations on permitting oral transfer agreements to be validated at a later date by a writing that complies with the requirements of § 204(a). *Cf. Konigsberg Int'l Inc. v. Rice,* 16 F.3d 355, 357 (9th Cir.1994) (holding that copyright owner's letter, written "three and a half years after the alleged oral agreement, a year and a half after its alleged term would have expired and 6 months into a contentious lawsuit," was "not the type of writing contemplated by section 204 as sufficient to effect

(Cont'd)

Appendix A

CONCLUSION

Inasmuch as the alleged retroactive written agreements purporting to transfer Chambliss's copyright interests to Miller could not also transfer Davis's copyright interests, Davis's accrued causes of action for infringement were not affected by the agreement between Chambliss and Miller. Accordingly, the District Court erred in granting summary judgment to defendants. The District Court's order of November 22, 2005 is hereby vacated and the cause is remanded for proceedings consistent with this opinion.

(Cont'd)

a transfer of the copyright," because it was not "a product of the parties' negotiations" and "came far too late to provide any reference point for the parties' license disputes"); *Magnuson*, 85 F.3d at 1429 n. 1 (stating that "the problem with the writing in [*Konigsberg*] was not so much that it was not contemporaneous with the agreement but that it was 'not the *type* of writing contemplated by section 204' " (quoting *Konigsberg*, 16 F.3d at 357)).

We also need not decide whether Chambliss's alleged oral agreement with Miller might be interpreted to have granted Miller a valid nonexclusive license to use the disputed compositions. *See Graham*, 144 F.3d at 235 ("nonexclusive licenses . . . may be granted orally" (quoting 3 *Nimmer* § 10.03[A][7])). We note that while a nonexclusive license from Chambliss to Miller might immunize Miller from Davis's claims of infringement against him for use of the disputed compositions, Miller would not, as a nonexclusive licensee, have been be able to grant licenses of any kind to his codefendants. Accordingly, even if Davis in such circumstances had no claim against Miller, she would continue to have claims against the other defendants.

APPENDIX B — MEMORANDUM, OPINION AND ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK DATED NOVEMBER 22, 2005

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

03 CV. 993 (CSH)

SHARICE DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

-against-

MARY J. BLIGE, BRUCE MILLER, RONALD LAWRENCE, KWAME HOLLAND, DANA STINSON, AUSAR MUSIC, MARY J. BLIGE PUBLISHING, BRUCE MILLER PUBLISHING, KWAME HOLLAND PUBLISHING, MARY J. BLIGE MUSIC, DAYNA S. DAY PUBLISHING CO., WARNER-TAMERLANE PUBLISHING CO., UNIVERSAL MUSIC GROUP, INC., UNIVERSAL STUDIOS, INC., UNIVERSAL MUSIC PUBLISHING GROUP, UNIVERSAL-MCA MUSIC PUBLISHING, UNIVERSAL MUSIC & VIDEO DISTRIBUTION, CORP., and MCA RECORDS, INC.,

Defendants.

Appendix B

MEMORANDUM, OPINION AND ORDER

HAIGHT, Senior District Judge.

This is an action asserting copyright claims under the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101 et. seq., a claim for declaratory judgment under 28 U.S.C. § 2201, and state law claims for unfair competition, unjust enrichment, and for consumer protection claims under the New York General Business Law §§ 349 and 350.[1] Defendants move for summary judgment as to all of plaintiff's claims.

I. BACKGROUND

The dispute in the instant action centers upon the release in 2001 of an album entitled "No More Drama" (hereinafter, the "Album"), performed by the defendant songwriter and recording artist Mary J. Blige. J. Davis Decl., Ex. A ¶ 25. Since its release, the Album has achieved triple platinum status. Page Decl., Ex. I. Plaintiff Sharice Davis alleges that two of the songs contained on the Album, "LOVE" and "Keep it Moving" (hereinafter referred to collectively or individually as the "Album Composition(s)"), infringe her copyright in two works of original authorship, "L.O.V.E." and "Don't Trade in My Love" (hereinafter referred to collectively or individually as the "Disputed Composition(s)"). Page Decl., Exhs. F & G. Specifically, Davis claims that the Album Composition "LOVE" is virtually identical to the

---

1. Plaintiff, in her complaint, asserted a claim for violation of Lanham Act § 43(a). In Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, plaintiff did not oppose the motion as to the Lanham Act claim, and it is therefore considered withdrawn.

Appendix B

Disputed Composition "L.O.V.E.," and the Album Composition "Keep it Moving" bears substantial similarity to the Disputed Composition "Don't Trade in My Love." *Id.* The labels and packaging of the Album identify Blige, her brother Bruce Miller, Dana Stinson, Ronald Lawrence, and Kwame Holland as co-writers of the Album Compositions.[2] Complaint ¶¶ 62-63. Each of these defendants, along with their respective music publishing companies, also named as defendants, join the present motion for summary judgment as Moving Defendants.[3]

The circumstances surrounding the creation of the Disputed Compositions are at issue. In deposition testimony, Davis conceded that the Disputed Compositions were co-authored by non-party Bruce Chambliss, defendant Miller's father. Page Decl., Ex. B

---

2. Blige, Miller, Lawrence, and Holland are credited as co-writers of Album Composition "LOVE". Blige Miller, and Stinson are credited as co-writers of Album Composition "Keep it Moving."

3. These defendants are: Ausar Music Publishing, Ltd. (Lawrence's music publishing company), Dayna's Day Publishing (Stinson's music publishing company), Warner-Tamerlane Publishing Corp. (publishing company that owns, controls, and/or administers Stinson's musical compositions), Universal Music Group, Inc., Universal Studios, Inc., Universal Music Publishing, Inc., Universal-MCA Music Publishing, Universal Music & Video Distribution Corp. (engaged in recording, publishing, distributing, marketing, and selling musical compositions and recordings, including Blige's musical compositions and recordings). J. Davis Decl., Ex. A ¶¶ 11, 17-23.

at 22, 152, 156-62, 165, 172-3, 175-6, 278, 305. Davis registered the Disputed Compositions with the United States Copyright Office on two occasions, listing Chambliss as a co-author (one set bearing the date August 2, 2002, the other undated). J. Davis Decl., Exhs. B & C. In deposition testimony, Miller likewise asserts that Chambliss is the author of Disputed Composition "L.O.V.E." Page Decl., Ex. E at 226. Miller also presents two written agreements (hereinafter, the "Written Agreement(s)"), in which Chambliss assigns his rights in each of the Disputed Compositions to Miller. Chambliss Decl., Exhs. A & B. The Written Agreements are dated June 23, 2004, one day prior to Chambliss' deposition. The Written Agreements each provide that "[Bruce Chambliss] does hereby sell, assign, transfer and set over unto Bruce Miller d/b/a CWAB Music (SESAC), its successors and assigns, an undivided one hundred percent (100%) share in and to all of [Bruce Chambliss's] right, title and interest in the [Disputed Composition] of the universe-wide copyrights in and to the musical composition . . . IN WITNESS WHEREOF, [Bruce Chambliss] has duly executed this instrument of transfer as of the date I first create [sic] the above-referenced Composition . . ." *Id.* According to Defendants, the Written Agreements served to memorialize a prior oral transfer by Chambliss of all his musical compositions to Miller. J. Davis Decl., Exhs. E & F (Miller Tr. at 98-99, 106; Chambliss Tr. at 37-8, 114, 157, 166). Davis hotly contests the existence of any oral transfer. Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment at 4-8,

14-15. The alleged oral transfer first came to light during the Miller deposition on December 9, 2003. Page Decl., Ex. E at 98-99.

Davis' Complaint alleges six claims. Davis' First Claim, for copyright infringement, asserts that Defendants engaged in unauthorized copying, distribution, sale and performance of Davis' copyrighted works and that such infringement was intentional, willful and with full knowledge of Davis' copyrights. She seeks both monetary damages and injunctive relief restraining Defendants and their agents from reproducing, distributing, or selling the Album or the Disputed Compositions.

Davis' Second Claim is a prayer for declaratory relief, requesting that the Court issue a declaration that Davis is owner of Album Composition "LOVE" and one-half owner of an undivided interest in Album Composition "Keep it Moving," and as such is entitled to one hundred percent of the royalties generated in connection with Album Composition "LOVE," and fifty percent of all royalties generated in connection with Album Composition "Keep it Moving."

Davis' Third Claim for violation of Lanham Act § 43(a), asserts that Defendants falsely designated the origin of their goods in interstate commerce by falsely identifying and misrepresenting the authors of the Album Compositions. Davis seeks injunctive relief and damages.

Appendix B

Davis' Fourth Claim, for unfair competition, asserts that Defendants knowingly and willfully confuse the public "by creating the false and misleading impression that the [Disputed Compositions] were authored by persons other than Davis." Complaint ¶ 99.

Davis' Fifth Claim alleges unjust enrichment against defendants Blige and Miller.

Davis' Sixth Claim asserts violations under the New York General Business Law, claiming that defendants' acts were intentionally designed to mislead the public by creating the false impression that Disputed Compositions were authored by persons other than Davis, conduct which constitutes deceptive acts and practices in the conduct of trade and commerce and false advertising in violation of §§ 349 and 350 of the New York General Business Law.

Defendants move for summary judgment as to the copyright infringement claim on the basis of the Written Agreements. Defendants contend that these agreements reflect an assignment of Chambliss' copyright interests to Miller, who, thereby possessing the rights of a co-author, cannot infringe the copyright as a matter of law.

Davis resists the motion as to all aspects, with an exception as to her Third Claim for relief under the Lanham Act. Davis did not reply to Defendants' motion for summary judgment as to this count.

Appendix B

II. DISCUSSION

For the reasons that follow, I grant defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment as to all Davis' claims.

A. Standard of Review on Motion for Summary Judgment Pursuant to Rule 56

Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that a court shall grant a motion for summary judgment "if the pleading, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue of material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(c); *see also Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 106 S.Ct. 2548, 91 L.Ed.2d 265 (1986). "The party seeking summary judgment bears the burden of establishing that no genuine issue of material fact exists and that the undisputed facts establish her right to judgment as a matter of law." *Rodriguez v. City of New York*, 72 F.3d 1051, 1060-61 (2d Cir.1995). The substantive law governing the case will identify those facts which are material and "only disputes over facts that might affect the outcome of the suit under governing law will properly preclude the entry of summary judgment." *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986).

In determining whether a genuine issue of material fact exists, a court must resolve all ambiguities and draw all reasonable inferences against the moving party.

Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 587, 106 S.Ct. 1348, 89 L.Ed.2d 538 (1986). If there is "any evidence in the record from any source from which a reasonable inference could be drawn in favor of the non-moving party," then summary judgment should be denied. *Chambers v. TRM Copy Centers Corp.*, 43 F.3d 29, 37 (2d Cir.1994).

B. Copyright Infringement

The defendants' motion rests upon Chambliss' alleged transfer to Miller of his rights in the Disputed Compositions. The defendants contend that Chambliss orally transferred these rights sometime between late 1998 and early 1999, and that this oral transfer was ratified by the Written Agreements between Chambliss and Miller, signed on June 23, 2004. The Copyright Act requires that transfers of copyright ownership be made in writing. 17 U.S.C. § 204(a). The writing requirement may be satisfied, however, by the copyright owner's subsequent execution of a writing confirming the earlier oral agreement. *Eden Toys, Inc. v. Florelee Undergarment Co., Inc.*, No. 80 CIV. 2242, 1984 WL 2120, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 31, 1984); *Dan-Dee Imps., Inc. v. Well-Made Toy Mfg. Co.*, 524 F.Supp. 615, 618 (E.D.N.Y.1981); Melvin Nimmer & David Nimmer 1 Nimmer on Copyright § 6.10 (2005) (hereinafter "Nimmer"). The first question, then, is whether or not an oral agreement did in fact exist between Chambliss and Miller.

Appendix B

A number of inconsistencies are apparent in the testimony describing the alleged oral transfer and subsequent written confirmation. Most significant of these is Chambliss' testimony as to the timing of the alleged oral transfer. Chambliss claims he was motivated to sign over his rights in all of his musical works to his son because he knew he would be going to prison. Chambliss was incarcerated for six and a half months prior to or in 1997 and again from March 2001 until the spring of 2003. Page Decl., Ex. L at 6-7, 15-16, 39. The earlier incarceration took place before the creation of the Disputed Compositions, whereas the later sentence was served after the song "L.O.V.E." had already been used by Miller. Page Decl., Ex. E at 95. Thus Chambliss' recollection appears to be in error. Chambliss' timing is not only internally inconsistent, it is also contradicted by the testimony of Miller, who dates the transfer to either late 1998 or early 1999. *Id.* at 98. Neither Chambliss nor Miller provides any further details or specific terms of the oral transfer. They both testify simply that Chambliss orally transferred all the songs he had ever written to Miller.

Furthermore, the existence of the alleged oral agreement was unknown to any of the other parties involved in this lawsuit until Miller's deposition on December 9, 2003. In Chambliss' deposition testimony, which both confirms the oral transfer and makes reference to a written agreement memorializing that transfer, Chambliss was unable to recall the day, or even the month, in which he executed the written agreement, despite the fact that the written agreement is dated

June 23, 2004, the day before the Chambliss deposition was taken. Page Decl., Ex. L at 114, Page Decl., Ex. O. Nor was he able to recall which songs were listed in the written agreement, or whether these songs had already been used or would be used sometime in the future. Page Decl., Ex. L at 115-116. Finally, Davis maintains that Chambliss told her, in the presence of a witness, Catherine Ottaviani, that she could have all the songs they had co-written, that those songs were hers to keep and to do with them as she wished. Page Decl., Ex. E at 184. Taken together, these inconsistencies amount to a factual issue that must be resolved by a finder of fact. In resolving all ambiguities and drawing all inferences against Defendants, as the movants, I conclude that a reasonable jury could find an oral agreement never existed between Chambliss and Miller.

Since a genuine issue exists as to whether Chambliss ever orally transferred his rights in the Prior Compositions to Miller, the Court need not consider whether the Written Agreements are sufficient to satisfy the writing requirement as a written ratification of a prior oral transfer.

Defendants contend, however, that even if there was no prior oral transfer, thus making the June 23, 2004 agreements the first transfer by Chambliss to Miller, the written agreements would nonetheless be valid to defeat Davis' claims. I agree. Defendants argue that, as a co-owner of the copyright in the Disputed Compositions, Chambliss may grant a retroactive license to the works that cures past infringement. The Written

Agreements, defendants claim, serve to retroactively transfer the Disputed Compositions to Miller. Defendants argue that, having effected authorization from one joint copyright owner, they are immunized from any copyright infringement action brought by the other joint owner.

Despite the factual questions that abound as to any prior oral agreement between Chambliss and Miller, there exists no genuine issue as to the intent of co-author Chambliss to transfer his rights to Miller, nor his realization of this intent in the Written Agreements of June 23, 2004. Lower court opinions on this question, including those of this court, are generally in agreement. Where there is no dispute between transferor and transferee of a copyright as to the validity of the transfer, such a transfer has been consistently upheld. This is the case even where the license or transfer takes place after the institution of an action for copyright infringement, and indeed, even where the plaintiff in the action is the other co-owner of the copyright and the retroactive license or transfer by one co-owner serves to bar the infringement claim of the other co-owner. *See Country Road v. MP3.COM, Inc.*, 279 F.Supp.2d 325 (S.D.N.Y.2003) (settlement agreement between defendants and co-owner granting defendant retroactive reproduction rights barred any infringement claim by remaining co-owners and cured any past infringement); *Copyright.net Music Publishing LLC v. MP3.COM*, 2003 WL 740757 (S.D.N.Y. March 4, 2003) (same); *Silverstein v. Fox Entertainment Group, Inc.*, 2004 WL 1620895 (S.D.N.Y. July 19, 2004) (retroactive

license, obtained after alleged infringement occurred and after institution of legal action, immunized defendant from infringement); *Lone Wolf McQuade Assocs. v. CBS Inc.*, 961 F.Supp. 587, 597 (S.D.N.Y.) (retroactive license cures past infringement); *Tuff-N-Rumble Mgmt., Inc.*, 2000 WL 1808486 (E.D.La. Dec. 8, 2000) (co-owner's grant of retroactive license to co-defendant during litigation barred plaintiff's infringement claims).

In *Silverstein v. Fox Entertainment*, a publicist commissioned an artist to create an animated character, for use in a variety of campaigns. Shortly thereafter, as the publicist began to promote the animated character, she discovered that Twentieth Century Fox was producing a similar character for use in an animated feature film. The publicist initiated suit against Fox, seeking to enjoin the film company from distributing or displaying any products featuring the animated character. In the course of the litigation, it came to light that the animated character was copied entirely from a copyrighted beaver created by a clip art company, which in turn had hired an artist to draw the character for the company. The artist and the clip art company each owned an undivided one-half interest in the animated character. The publicist purchased the artist's rights in and to the animated character retroactive to the date of creation. In order to avoid liability to the publicist, Fox subsequently entered into an agreement with the clip-art company for a non-exclusive license, retroactive to the creation of the animated character. The publicist attempted to maintain her suit against Fox. The court found, however, that both plaintiff and defendant had a

right to use the animated character, through the retroactive transfer and retroactive license respectively. Judge Holwell's opinion explains:

> "There can be no copyright infringement action by a holder of a copyright against a licensee of another holder of the same copyright. The retroactivity of the licensing agreement between [the clip art company] and Fox has no necessary effect on its power to immunize Fox against claims of infringement of the Beaver copyright. A retroactive license *can cure past infringements*."

2004 WL 1620895, at *9 (citations and internal quotation marks omitted) (emphasis added). *A fortiori*, the same result obtains in the case of a retroactive complete and total assignment, which is the situation presented by the case at bar, even if one assumes that there was no prior oral agreement between Chambliss and Miller.

The reason for this seemingly draconian outcome is that a co-owner has a legal right to grant a license in a work without another co-owner's permission or to transfer his rights in the copyright freely. *See* 1 Nimmer § 6.11. Absent an agreement to the contrary, one joint owner may always transfer his interest in the work to a third party, including the grant of non-exclusive licenses. Only an exclusive license requires the consent of any other joint owners, because such a license would have the effect of transferring the other joint owners'

interest to a third party. *Id.* A joint author is entitled only to an accounting of his share of the profits for the other joint author's use of the joint work. *See Thompson v. Larson*, 147 F.3d 195, 199 (2d Cir.1998). "[A]n action for infringement between joint owners will not lie because an individual cannot infringe his own copyright." *Weissman v. Freemen*, 868 F.2d 1313, 1318 (2d Cir.1989).

In the case at bar, Davis' status as joint owner with Chambliss, who in turn transferred his interests to Miller, bars her from stating a claim for copyright infringement against Miller, or any of the other defendants, his licensees. *See Weissman*, 868 F.2d at 1318; *McKay v. Columbia Broadcasting Sys., Inc.*, 324 F.2d 762, 763 (2d Cir.1963) ("a license from a co-holder of a copyright immunizes the licensee from liability to the other co-holder for copyright infringement") (internal citations omitted).

Davis relies on only two copyright cases, in urging the Court to rule against a retroactive transfer. One of these, in this district, *David v. Showtime/The Movie Channel, Inc.*, 697 F.Supp. 752 (S.D.N.Y.1988), is inapposite. That case involved a retroactive *application* to plaintiffs for a license, as prescribed by a longstanding consent decree between plaintiffs and the Department of Justice. Defendants' license had expired several years earlier, however both parties entered into lengthy negotiations intending to renew their licensing agreements. *Id.* at 754. When the parties could not agree on a new licensing rate, defendants made a written

application to plaintiffs to become licensed again, intending this license to be retroactive to the date of the last license's expiry. *Id.* at 755. The court refused to construe defendants' application for a retroactive license as a bar to plaintiff's claim for copyright infringement over the intervening years between expiration of the first license and the later application for a renewal. *Id.* at 764. The only other opinion cited by Davis involving copyright infringement claims, *Leicester v. Warner Bros.*, 1998 WL 34016724 (C.D.Cal. May 29, 1998), was decided principally on the ground that the defendant possessed a non-exclusive license, and therefore did not have a right to sub-license others. *Leicester v. Warner Bros.*, 1998 WL 34016724, at *5.[4]

Perhaps recognizing this state of the law and its consequences for her case, Davis urges the Court to invalidate the Written Agreements on the basis that the agreements are unsupported by consideration. Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment at 19. This argument has little merit. Davis has no standing to contest the Agreements' validity. *Cf. County of Tioga v. Solid Waste Indus., Inc.*, 178 A.D.2d 873, 577 N.Y.S.2d 922 (3d Dep't 1991) ("We initially reject [the] argument that as a judgment creditor [of co-defendant] it has

---

4. The court later stated that it rejected the defendant's argument "for another reason," explaining that it did not accept the idea that a later grant of a license could validate earlier infringement. *Id.* at *6. That alternative ground for decision is contrary to the great weight of authority cited in text, and I decline to follow it.

standing to raise the affirmative defense of lack of consideration in the foreclosure action because it is a necessary party to the action. This affirmative defense is personal to the parties to the contract, and . . . a stranger to the mortgage and the underlying contract, may not assert it"). Furthermore, "parties to a contract are free to make their bargain, even if the consideration exchanged is grossly unequal or of dubious value." *Minuteman Press Int'l, Inc. v. Matthews*, 232 F.Supp.2d 11, 16 (E.D.N.Y.2002), *quoting Apfel v. Prudential-Bache Secs., Inc.*, 81 N.Y.2d 470, 475, 600 N.Y.S.2d 433, 435, 616 N.E.2d 1095 (1993); *Granite Partners, L.P. v. Bear, Stearns & Co. Inc.*, 58 F.Supp.2d 228, 252 (S.D.N.Y.1999).[5]

Davis is unable to provide factual evidence to contradict Chambliss' written agreement, verified in his deposition testimony, as to his intent and transfer of his right in the Disputed Compositions to Miller. As a matter of law, Davis' copyright infringement claim is barred.

C. Declaratory Judgment Claim

Since Davis has no claim for copyright infringement against defendants, her claim for declaratory judgment must also be denied. Davis' status as joint owner not only bars her from stating a claim for copyright infringement, it also precludes a declaration that Davis

---

5. Moreover, it appears that no consideration is required under federal law to effectuate a copyright transfer, unless such consideration is required by the transaction itself. 3 Nimmer § 10.03.

has any ownership interest in the Album Compositions. A non-participating co-owner acquires no property rights in a newly created derivative work. *See Weissman v. Freeman*, 868 F.2d 1313, 1318 (2d Cir.1989); *Maurizio v. Goldsmith*, 84 F.Supp.2d 455, 467 (S.D.N.Y.2000). Since Miller is a co-owner of the Disputed Compositions, he is authorized to incorporate them into derivative works. Davis cannot obtain a property interest in the derivative works solely on the basis of her co-ownership of the Disputed Compositions.

D. State Law Claims

Plaintiff's remaining claims are asserted under state law. Where, as here, all federal law claims are dismissed before trial, "the balance of factors to be considered under the pendent jurisdiction doctrine—judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity—will point toward declining to exercise jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims." *See Silverstein*, 2004 WL 1620895, at *9 (citing *502 *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 n. 7, 108 S.Ct. 614, 98 L.Ed.2d 720 (1988)). I therefore decline to exercise jurisdiction over the remaining state law claims.

Appendix B

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the first, second and third claims alleged in the complaint are dismissed with prejudice. Because the Court declines to assert subject matter jurisdiction over the fourth, fifth and sixth claims, they are dismissed without prejudice.

It is SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York
November 22, 2005

s/ Charles S. Haight, Jr.
Charles S. Haight, Jr.
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPENDIX C — ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT DENYING PETITION FOR REHEARING FILED MARCH 4, 2008

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe
CLERK OF COURT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse, 500 Pearl Street, in the City of New York, on the ___ day of March two thousand and eight,

No. 05-6844-cv

Sharice Davis,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

Mary J. Blige, Bruce Miller, Ronald Lawrence, Kwame Holland, Dana Stinson, Ausar Music, Mary J. Blige Publishing, Bruce Miller Publishing, Kwame Holland Publishing, Mary J. Blige Music, Dayna S. Day Publishing, Warner-Tamerlane Music Publishing Corp., Universal Music Group, Inc., Universal Studios, Inc., Universal Music Publishing Group, Universal-MCA Music Publishing, Universal Music & Video Distribution Corp., and MCA Records, Inc.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appendix C

ORDER

Appellee Mary Blige, Appellee Mary J. Blige Music, Appellee Bruce Miller Publishing, et al. having filed a petition for panel rehearing, or, in the alternative, for rehearing *en banc*, and the panel that determined the appeal having considered the request for panel rehearing, and the active members of the Court having considered the request for rehearing *en banc*,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petition is denied.

For the Court:
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

By: s/ Frank Perez
Frank Perez, Deputy Clerk